New Series *Volume VIII, Number 29* *February 1957*

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language

Editors
PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor
JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

Good and Evil; Light and Darkness; Joy and Sorrow in *Beowulf*. By Herbert G. Wright 1

The Significance of the 'Garlande Gay' in the Allegory of *Pearl*. By Ian Bishop 12

The World of the Ballad. By Patricia Ingham 22

Johnson's Last Allusion to Mary Queen of Scots. By Mary Lascelles 32

NOTE

Smollett's *The Tears of Scotland*. A Hitherto Unnoticed Printing and Some Comments on the Text (William Scott) 38

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir Philip Sidney (J.R.) 42

REVIEWS, ETC.:

An Old English Grammar, by Randolph Quirk and C. L. Wrenn, 43; Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen, by Helmut Gneuss, 45; The Peterborough Chronicle, edited by Dorothy Whitelock with an Appendix by Cecily Clark, 51; Studien zu John Gower, by Maria

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. Bennett; John Butt; R. W. Chapman; H. B. Charlton; Una M. Ellis-Fermor; Sir Ifor Evans; Sir Walter Greg; Sir Herbert Grierson; Edith J. Morley; Allardyce Nicoll; A. W. Reed; Percy Simpson; Kenneth Sisam; D. Nichol Smith; James R. Sutherland; Alice Walker; Dorothy Whitelock; F. P. Wilson; J. Dover Wilson; C. L. Wrenn.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC. (*cont.*):

Wickert, 54; *Sir Orfeo*, edited by A. J. Bliss, 57; Sir David Lindsay. Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits, edited by James Kinsley, with a Critical Introduction by Agnes Mure Mackenzie and a Foreword by Ivor Brown, 59; *The Contention* and Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*, by Charles Tyler Prouty, 60; Shakespeare Survey 8, edited by Allardyce Nicoll, 63; Shakespeare's Use of Music, by John H. Long, 64; The Tragedies of George Chapman, by Ennis Rees, 67; Teague, Shenkin and Sawney, by J. O. Bartley, 68; The Poems of Richard Corbett, edited by J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper, 70; Sir Thomas Browne. *Religio Medici*, edited by Jean-Jacques Denonain, 71; The Poetical Works of John Milton, edited by Helen Darbishire, 78; The Letters of Daniel Defoe, edited by George Harris Healey, 95; Laureate of Peace. On the Genius of Alexander Pope, by G. Wilson Knight, 96; Diderot and Sterne, by Alice Green Fredman, 98; Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, edited by W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith, and George L. Lam, 100; Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century, edited by Roberta Florence Brinkley, 101; Le Roman régionaliste dans les Îles britanniques, by L. Leclaire; A General Analytical Bibliography of the Regional Novelists of the British Isles, 1800–1950, by L. Leclaire, 102; The Manuscript Poems of A. E. Housman, edited by T. B. Haber, 104; Short Notices, 107; Summary of Periodical Literature, 109.

Robert Conquest

NEW LINES

'This admirable collection. . . . *New Lines* should be read by all without prejudice, and its virtues appreciated—before the dust settles again and the stage is swept clean of the neo-empsonians in their turn.' *Poetry Review.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Important Reprints

KEATS

Sidney Colvin

MACMILLAN'S POCKET LIBRARY, 6s.

THE POETICAL WORKS

of Alexander Pope

with notes and Introductory Memoir

THE GLOBE EDITION, 10s. 6d.

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD.

Early English Text Society

(*Founded in* 1864)

Honorary Director: C. T. ONIONS, C.B.E., F.B.A.

Honorary Associate Director: PROFESSOR NORMAN DAVIS, M.B.E.

Membership is open to institutions and to private persons on application to the Honorary Secretary, R. W. Burchfield, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford. The annual subscription is 2 guineas ($6.00) which entitles members to receive new texts as they are published, normally two volumes a year. Members may also purchase past publications at the advertised prices less discount at twopence in the shilling. A list of publications is available on request.

The Works of John Dryden, I

EDITED BY

E. N. HOOKER & H. T. SWEDENBERG

A new edition of Dryden's works, the first since 1808, edited according to the standards of modern scholarship in twenty volumes. The first volume, containing Poems 1649–1680, is now available. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS. 64*s. net*

Serial Publication in England Before 1750

R. M. WILES

The first thorough account of the serial publication of books in the early eighteenth century. 50*s. net*

Othello

NEW SHAKESPEARE

This volume in the New Shakespeare edition has been edited by Professor J. Dover Wilson and Miss Alice Walker. There is an introduction, stage history, extensive notes, and a glossary. 17*s.* 6*d. net*

The Sermons of John Donne, VIII

EDITED BY

G. R. POTTER & E. SIMPSON

An authoritative and complete edition of Donne's sermons in ten volumes. Volumes I, II, VI, and VII have already been published. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS.

Each volume, 56*s.* 6*d. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

GOOD AND EVIL; LIGHT AND DARKNESS; JOY AND SORROW IN *BEOWULF*

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

THESE contrasting opposites are, of course, by no means peculiar to *Beowulf*. They are part of the stuff of everyday life, and so it is not surprising to find that two of these groups appear in the gnomic verses in Cotton MS. Tiberius B I,[1] where various truisms are assembled. Yet even though these groups in themselves may appear trite, if we examine *Beowulf* from the point of view of each, the three, taken together, may help in the interpretation of the whole work.

In his lecture 'Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics'[2] Professor J. R. R. Tolkien analysed the poem as a struggle between good and evil, the one quality being embodied in the hero, the other in Grendel, his mother, and the dragon. This grouping of the monsters was questioned by Mr. T. M. Gang,[3] who distinguishes the dragon from the others, because, unlike Grendel, he 'is nowhere called God's enemy, or a fiend, or joyless; in fact, no words of moral disapprobation are applied to him; his wrath is not aroused by any unreasonable jealousy of human happiness but by a very definite outrage', and consequently Beowulf's two combats are but loosely connected. The facts stated by Mr. Gang are incontestable but his conclusions may be open to discussion. In the first place it should be recalled that Grendel's mother also belongs to the race of giants and that as a result of this origin she too bears the curse imposed on the progeny of Cain; indeed, in the genealogical table she is one step nearer to Cain. Yet none of the above-mentioned condemnation of Grendel is applied to her. Further, she suffers what is in her opinion 'a very definite outrage', the loss of her son, without anyone thinking it necessary to defend her act of vengeance.

Perhaps it would also be advisable to look at the dragon more closely. It is true that the poet appears to concede that a wrong was inflicted on him by the plundering of his treasure. But that merely illustrates his ability to enter into the dragon's point of view, for after all, the author of *Beowulf* could hardly be unaware that even if possession lasting 300 years conferred a strong title to ownership, one could not ignore the appropriation by the dragon of a hoard which had once belonged to the human race. Ethically there was no claim and therefore no grievance. In any case, one may

[1] Cf. *Maxims*, ii. 50–51, in *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ed. E. V. K. Dobbie (New York, 1942), p. 57.

[2] *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xxii (1936), 245–95.

[3] 'Approaches to *Beowulf*', *R.E.S.*, N.S. iii (1952), 1–12.

doubt whether the poet felt more sympathy for the dragon than for Grendel. The mere mention of Grendel's exile, a word that always stirred the heart of an Old English poet, is enough to call forth the epithets ***earmsceapen*** (1351) and ***wonsæli*** (105), terms which betoken a momentary commiseration even for the ***heorowearh hetelic*** (1267). Moreover, the words used in describing the relations between Grendel and the dragon on the one hand, and mankind on the other, offer some notable parallels. Thus Hrothgar tells Beowulf:

> Sorh is me to secgan on sefan minum
> gumena ængum hwæt me Grendel hafað
> ***hynðo*** on Heorote mid his ***hete***þancum,
> færniða gefremed (473–6)

and of the dragon we learn how

> se guðsceaða Geata leode
> ***hatode*** ond ***hynde***. (2318–19)

Akin to these passages is that in which Beowulf on his arrival in Denmark speaks of the reports of Grendel's activities that have reached him in Geatland:

> deogol dæd***hata*** deorcum nihtum
> eaweð þurh egsan uncuðne nið,
> ***hynðu*** ond hrafyl. (275–7)

And the phrase ***þurh egsan*** carries us forward to the lines which depict the dragon's revenge and give a hint of the approaching death of the hero:

> Wæs se fruma egeslic
> leodum on lande, swa hyt lungre wearð
> on hyra sincgifan sare geendod. (2309–11)

Terror is inspired both by Grendel and the dragon; the gloomy foreboding of Beowulf's picked men in the hall at Heorot on the eve of the fray (691–3) is balanced by the panic-stricken flight of his followers before the dragon's fiery breath (2598–9). The two monsters are described as ***atol***, which clearly expresses the feeling of repugnance that they arouse. The insidious menace of the one and the blindly furious ravages of the other earn for them the strong disapproval implicit in the epithet ***man-scaða***,[1] 'wicked ravager'.

In all this there is little to differentiate the monsters. The same is true of their abodes. As a reputed descendant of Cain, whose expulsion from all arable land in *Genesis*[2] is converted by the poet into banishment in the ***westen*** (1265), Grendel has his haunts in the wild forests, moors, and fens, and lives in a cave under a lake. At times the scenery, with its cliffs and

[1] Cf. 712, 737, 2514.

[2] iv. 11, 12.

windige næssas,[1] reminds one of the setting for the dragon's home, which is *on þære westenne*, near the sea, and difficult of access. The barrow is singular in that a stream gushes forth from within, and so the *eorðdraca* in one way or another is never far from water, even if he does not live in it like the *sædracan* (1426).

The affinity between these two kinds of *draca* is worth considering because it may throw light on the monstrous nature of the dragon. The rarity of the word *sæ-draca* provides little material for the lexicographer. The Brussels manuscript of Aldhelm's *De Virginitate* renders 'leviathan' by *sædracan*, which is accompanied by the gloss 'serpens aquaticus'.[2] A word which can be related to both 'leviathan' and 'serpens aquaticus' is somewhat vague, but at least it shows that the *sædracan* can be classified as belonging to the species of serpents. As for the dragon in *Beowulf*, there is no doubt about his serpentine nature. The terms applied to him, *hringboga* (2561) and *wohbogen* (2827), are amplified by the vivid description of his coiling movement, as Beowulf awaits his onslaught:

> Stiðmod gestod wið steapne rond
> winia bealdor, ða se wyrm *gebeah*
> snude *tosomne*; he on searwum bad.
> Gewat ða byrnende *gebogen* scriðan . . . . (2566–9)

This conception of the dragon was by no means peculiar to the author of *Beowulf*, as the examples given in *O.E.D.* under *Dragon* and *Worm* clearly prove. For additional evidence one may turn to Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, where a 'dragoun' is presented as lurking under flowers in order to strike its victim: 'As vnder floures is shroudid the dragoun' (i. 3963), exactly in the same way as a serpent: 'She lich a serpent daryng vnder floures' (i. 6434). And in popular tradition the identification of dragon and serpent lingered long. A curious example of this was published in 1614:

> True and Wonderfull. A Discourse Relating a Strange and Monstrous Serpent, or Dragon, Lately discouered, and yet liuing. To the great Annoyance and diuers Slaughters both of Men and Cattell: by his strong and violent Poyson: In Sussex, two miles from Horsam, in a Wood called St. Leonards Forrest, and thirtie Miles from London. . . .

This beast, nine feet or more in length, emitted poisonous breath which

[1] Occasionally the language evokes the sea rather than a pool, and the line describing the route of Beowulf, Hrothgar, and their followers on the way thither, 'enge anpaðas, uncuð gelad', is the same as is used by the poet of *Exodus* about the march of the Israelites towards the Red Sea.

[2] See Bosworth–Toller under *sædraca*, and K. Bouterwek, 'Angelsächsische Glossen. Die ags. Glossen in dem Brüsseler Codex von Aldhelms Schrift *de Virgimitate*', *Zeitschrift für deutsche: Alterthum*, ix (1853), 424.

extended for four rods around him.[1] The readers of such news and those who for centuries had been acquainted with the ancient tradition of the dragon could have little doubt of the evil nature of all similar creatures, who were quite prepared to attack without provocation. Bearing this in mind, we ought not to make too much of the injury which, in his opinion, the dragon in *Beowulf* had received at the hands of men. He was a serpent, and though more violent and less cunning than the serpent in the Garden of Eden, he also was dangerous to human beings. The poem draws no parallel between the two and makes no direct statement about the perpetual warfare between the serpent race and the descendants of Adam. Yet the fact should not be overlooked that the reign of terror instituted by the dragon was not the first of its kind. His nocturnal incendiary habits are previously mentioned (2270–4), and his vengeance for the rifling of the hoard is but a renewal of earlier strife.[2] The dragon, like the giant Grendel, is an enemy of mankind, and the audience of *Beowulf* can have entertained no sympathy for either the one or the other.

Corresponding to the clash between good and evil is that between light and darkness. A people like the Old English, largely concerned with agriculture and scantily provided with artificial light, watched sunrise and sunset with an interest less common in a complex, urban society. J. L. Lowes has emphasized the separation of the medieval from the modern world in respect of the calculation of time, with the result that 'unless we are mariners or woodsmen or astronomers or simple folk in lonely places, we never any longer reckon with the *sky*'.[3] If that was true in Chaucer's time, it was even truer of the observation of waxing and waning light in the eighth century, when the fear of darkness and of solitary, waste lands induced a willing acceptance of tales of giants lurking in the fens. Grendel is such a giant—a demon, an *ellengæst* (86) and *scynscapa* (707)—who roams about moors and fens and haunts remote places. Enveloped in darkness, he is irritated by the erection of Heorot, and the poet heightens the general impression of blackness by calling him a *feond on helle* (101) and *deorc deapscua* (160) who *sinnihte heold mistige moras* (161–2). It is precisely because Grendel is a monster of darkness that the author of *Beowulf*, choosing his words with all care, says that Hrothgar's councillors could not expect a '*bright* remedy' from the slayer.[4] He lies in wait and finally raids

[1] The title is quoted from W. C. Hazlitt, *Hand-Book to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain* (London, 1867), p. 585. For a reprint see *The Harleian Miscellany* (1808–13), iii. 109–12.

[2] 'wroht wæs geniwad' (2287).

[3] *Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1934), p. 7.

[4] 157–8. It is interesting to see how the image of brightness is applied to the sound of mirth in the hall, after the tragic episode of Finn and Hengest is over:

Gamen eft astah,
beorhtode bencsweg. (1160–1)

the hall. On the black nights *nihtbealwa mæst* descends on the *sincfage sel* (167, 193). The description of the Creation, with its picture of the *wlitebeorhtne wang* (93) and the sun and moon, has already been used as a contrast to the murky haunts of Grendel, and the landing of Beowulf and his followers in Denmark is the signal for the irradiation of the scene with a flood of brilliant light.

When the Geats end their voyage, they see the gleaming cliffs of Denmark. Their shields and armour are bright; the boar-images on their helmets, adorned with gold, shine resplendent. As they approach Heorot, it offers a spectacle even more radiant. It too is adorned with gold, a bright abode, a luminary that flashes over many lands. But the author is not yet content to leave this dazzling vision. Once more, when the travellers reach their destination, he dwells on their bright and shining armour, and when Beowulf stands before Hrothgar to announce his errand, his coat of mail becomes associated with the evening light that precedes the coming of darkness. At the banquet the mead is as bright as the voice of the bard is clear, and Beowulf confidently looks forward to the return next day of the sun clothed in radiance.[1] For the moment the terrors of night are in abeyance.

With the introduction of the Breca episode, however, the poet begins to prepare the listener for a change. Beowulf's grim struggle with the sea-beasts takes place by night; only the coming of morning reveals the deadliness of the encounter, when they are seen lying dead along the shore. This is a prelude to the fight with Grendel, and the very fact that Beowulf has dealt so successfully with nocturnal foes inspires confidence, not only in the hero, but also in the wise Geat councillors who urged him to undertake the voyage to relieve Hrothgar. At the end of the episode the King commits Heorot to the keeping of Beowulf. Soon the *sceadugenga* (703) is drawing near from the misty hillsides. He knows full well the *goldsele gumena . . . fættum fahne* (715–16). Within the building all is dark; nothing is visible except the hideous light that flashes from the eyes of the monster. But the quality of this light differs from that which illumined the scene a little earlier. It is like fire and is contrasted with the glory of God, the *scir Metod* (979).

The next day is one of cheerful normality. The giant has fled into the darkness, leaving his hand behind him. In the morning light the roof of Heorot shines resplendent, and again and again the rich, warm glow of gold is seen. As Grendel's attacks are made only on the *sweartum nihtum* (166–7), the moon can play no part as a background to the first half of the poem. Light, therefore, is predominantly that of the sun or of the metal which approaches most closely to it in the appeal to the eye. Certainly,

[1] 'sunne sweglwered' (606).

extended for four rods around him.[1] The readers of such news and those who for centuries had been acquainted with the ancient tradition of the dragon could have little doubt of the evil nature of all similar creatures, who were quite prepared to attack without provocation. Bearing this in mind, we ought not to make too much of the injury which, in his opinion, the dragon in *Beowulf* had received at the hands of men. He was a serpent, and though more violent and less cunning than the serpent in the Garden of Eden, he also was dangerous to human beings. The poem draws no parallel between the two and makes no direct statement about the perpetual warfare between the serpent race and the descendants of Adam. Yet the fact should not be overlooked that the reign of terror instituted by the dragon was not the first of its kind. His nocturnal incendiary habits are previously mentioned (2270–4), and his vengeance for the rifling of the hoard is but a renewal of earlier strife.[2] The dragon, like the giant Grendel, is an enemy of mankind, and the audience of *Beowulf* can have entertained no sympathy for either the one or the other.

Corresponding to the clash between good and evil is that between light and darkness. A people like the Old English, largely concerned with agriculture and scantily provided with artificial light, watched sunrise and sunset with an interest less common in a complex, urban society. J. L. Lowes has emphasized the separation of the medieval from the modern world in respect of the calculation of time, with the result that 'unless we are mariners or woodsmen or astronomers or simple folk in lonely places, we never any longer reckon with the *sky*'.[3] If that was true in Chaucer's time, it was even truer of the observation of waxing and waning light in the eighth century, when the fear of darkness and of solitary, waste lands induced a willing acceptance of tales of giants lurking in the fens. Grendel is such a giant—a demon, an *ellengæst* (86) and *scynscapa* (707)—who roams about moors and fens and haunts remote places. Enveloped in darkness, he is irritated by the erection of Heorot, and the poet heightens the general impression of blackness by calling him a *feond on helle* (101) and *deorc deapscua* (160) who *sinnihte heold mistige moras* (161–2). It is precisely because Grendel is a monster of darkness that the author of *Beowulf*, choosing his words with all care, says that Hrothgar's councillors could not expect a '*bright* remedy' from the slayer.[4] He lies in wait and finally raids

[1] The title is quoted from W. C. Hazlitt, *Hand-Book to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain* (London, 1867), p. 585. For a reprint see *The Harleian Miscellany* (1808–13), iii. 109–12.

[2] 'wroht wæs geniwad' (2287).

[3] *Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1934), p. 7.

[4] 157–8. It is interesting to see how the image of brightness is applied to the sound of mirth in the hall, after the tragic episode of Finn and Hengest is over:

Gamen eft astah,
beorhtode bencsweg. (1160–1)

the hall. On the black nights *nihtbealwa mæst* descends on the *sincfage sel* (167, 193). The description of the Creation, with its picture of the *wlitebeorhtne wang* (93) and the sun and moon, has already been used as a contrast to the murky haunts of Grendel, and the landing of Beowulf and his followers in Denmark is the signal for the irradiation of the scene with a flood of brilliant light.

When the Geats end their voyage, they see the gleaming cliffs of Denmark. Their shields and armour are bright; the boar-images on their helmets, adorned with gold, shine resplendent. As they approach Heorot, it offers a spectacle even more radiant. It too is adorned with gold, a bright abode, a luminary that flashes over many lands. But the author is not yet content to leave this dazzling vision. Once more, when the travellers reach their destination, he dwells on their bright and shining armour, and when Beowulf stands before Hrothgar to announce his errand, his coat of mail becomes associated with the evening light that precedes the coming of darkness. At the banquet the mead is as bright as the voice of the bard is clear, and Beowulf confidently looks forward to the return next day of the sun clothed in radiance.[1] For the moment the terrors of night are in abeyance.

With the introduction of the Breca episode, however, the poet begins to prepare the listener for a change. Beowulf's grim struggle with the sea-beasts takes place by night; only the coming of morning reveals the deadliness of the encounter, when they are seen lying dead along the shore. This is a prelude to the fight with Grendel, and the very fact that Beowulf has dealt so successfully with nocturnal foes inspires confidence, not only in the hero, but also in the wise Geat councillors who urged him to undertake the voyage to relieve Hrothgar. At the end of the episode the King commits Heorot to the keeping of Beowulf. Soon the *sceadugenga* (703) is drawing near from the misty hillsides. He knows full well the *goldsele gumena . . . fættum fahne* (715–16). Within the building all is dark; nothing is visible except the hideous light that flashes from the eyes of the monster. But the quality of this light differs from that which illumined the scene a little earlier. It is like fire and is contrasted with the glory of God, the *scir Metod* (979).

The next day is one of cheerful normality. The giant has fled into the darkness, leaving his hand behind him. In the morning light the roof of Heorot shines resplendent, and again and again the rich, warm glow of gold is seen. As Grendel's attacks are made only on the *sweartum nihtum* (166–7), the moon can play no part as a background to the first half of the poem. Light, therefore, is predominantly that of the sun or of the metal which approaches most closely to it in the appeal to the eye. Certainly,

[1] 'sunne sweglwered' (606).

after Grendel has vanished, there is a repeated emphasis on gold—in the tapestry hanging on the walls, in the weapons, the banner, and the trappings of the steeds presented to Beowulf by Hrothgar, and in the armour, arm-rings, and collar handed to the hero by Wealhtheow, as she moves through the hall, wearing her golden crown. But all this radiance is eclipsed when under cover of darkness Grendel's mother carries off Æschere to her retreat below the mere.

The passage that describes this spot is remarkable as a creation of the poetic imagination, and it would be futile to seek in it any close correspondence with reality. The atmosphere is the main thing, with its vague suggestion of the eerie and mysterious. The frost-covered trees strike chill, and even in broad daylight the wood overshadows the dark pool. The nocturnal fire on the flood provides light of a sort, but it bodes ill, like the fiery light of Grendel's eyes. Nevertheless, Beowulf plunges into the turbid water in full armour, his shining helmet standing out against the surrounding gloom. Once he is in the cave, the circumstances of the narrative require that he shall be able to look around. He is enabled to see, but again it is a fiery light that shines forth, revealing first one monster of darkness, then the other.

The same dramatic sense of contrast is displayed after Beowulf has assured Hrothgar of the death of both Grendel and his mother. Heorot, which they had so long menaced, towers up in its golden splendour, and next morning the black raven announces the return of the sun. This function is so unusual for a bird normally associated with death that one is tempted to regard it as another example of the employment of a symbol for the triumph of light and life over darkness and death. However that may be, the sun continues to irradiate the landscape when Beowulf and his men land on the coast of Geatland, bringing the news of victory over the monsters.

Just as Hrothgar, after protecting the Danes for fifty years (1769), in his old age has to endure the attacks of Grendel, so Beowulf, worn by time, after ruling the Geats for exactly the same period, is called upon to face a struggle with yet another monster, the most fearsome of all, the fiery dragon. He, too, is a creature of darkness and lurks in his barrow like Grendel in his den, awaiting impatiently the waning of daylight, and hastening back as dawn approaches. But in the interval he vomits fire and sets the homes of men ablaze. This fiery glow associates him with the earlier passages in which the light of Grendel's eyes and the light on the mere and in the cave are mentioned. Thus the *bryneleoma*, which flashes out as the dragon flies through the air at midnight, becomes a symbol of danger, and it is this angry glare that inevitably predominates in the latter part of the poem.

By contrast darkness in a metaphorical sense is transferred to the mind

of Beowulf (2331–2). The light that shone so freely in the narration of his youthful exploits has vanished; so, too, has the glittering splendour which united men and precious metal in happier times. The treasures of the dragon's hoard are committed to the darkness of the earth, and gold is no longer associated with human pleasure but with a deadly curse or the misery of captivity (2931, 3018). The only joy is that of the wolf and the raven, now restored to his wonted role, as they feast on the slain. The bright coats of mail shine momentarily, but soon they are lost in the roaring flame of the funeral pyre, while the black smoke climbs upward and is engulfed by the sky, on this still day when the tumult of the winds is silent.

Closely related to the coming and going of light and darkness are the fluctuations of joy and sorrow in *Beowulf*. The joy is intermingled with the social life of rulers and warriors. The erection of Heorot provides a setting for the conviviality of Hrothgar and his nobles, and the clear song of the bard is accompanied by the music of the harp. The banqueting scene on Beowulf's arrival at the Danish court again shows the *scop* singing to his instrument. Queen Wealhtheow and her daughter Freawaru move through the hall, handing round drinking-cups, and the laughter of the warriors is heard. The banqueting-scene on the following day is similar. The bard appears once more, and a lay is often sung. On this occasion, when Grendel's death is celebrated, wine as well as mead is served. As before, Wealhtheow passes through the hall, goblet in hand, but there are also cupbearers. At intervals, for the sake of variety, the poet describes the presentations to Beowulf and his men by Hrothgar, and to Beowulf by the Queen. Possibly he felt that a third banquet on the lines of the first two would be tedious: he imposes strict limits on the conviviality after the hero's triumphant return from the slaying of Grendel's mother. Hrothgar bids him partake of the banquet, and Beowulf, who has been promised rewards next morning, joyfully takes his seat. Then, after a few lines, the poet records that both Hrothgar and Beowulf retire to bed. Thus the problem of the narrator is solved in a realist manner.

For the same reason, no doubt, the author does not dwell at any length on the emotions aroused by Hrothgar's gifts. Nor does he delay his narrative to tell of the delight of Beowulf and his men on reaching their native land. It may be that the adjective *cuþe* in the lines:

> hie Geata clifu ongitan meahton,
> cuþe næssas (1911–12)

was intended to convey their pleasure at the sight of the familiar landmarks. The mention of the *hyðweard*, who for a long time had been looking for the 'beloved men' and was now quickly down by the sea, discloses a little more of the gladness with which the Geat warriors were awaited. But on the

whole the joy has to be divined. This is even truer of the scene at Hygelac's hall. Inevitably, after three banquets the poet was somewhat handicapped. He tells how Hygd carried round mead-cups as Wealhtheow had done, and from time to time there are presentations—Beowulf to Hygelac and Hygd, Hygelac to Beowulf. But the treatment is somewhat perfunctory. Here is no word of welcome, and emotions are left undefined. For the mirth and conviviality we must hark back to the earlier part of the poem.

Joy and sorrow are often contrasted in *Beowulf*, sometimes with striking effect. This applies to the monsters, as when Grendel laughs in his heart at the prospect of devouring the sleeping Geats, only to lament his defeat, wail over his pain, and seek his *wynleas wic* after Beowulf has wrenched his arm away at Heorot. However, such fluctuations of emotion are naturally most prominent in the human figures of the poem. The grief of Hrothgar and his people on account of Grendel's ravages gives place to relief and confidence on the arrival of Beowulf, and they shed no tears over the death of the giant who has plagued them so long. With typical understatement the poet declares:

> No his lifgedal
> sarlic þuhte secga ænegum. (841–2)

But the distress of the Danes is renewed by the loss of the peerless Æschere on the very night of the banquet to celebrate Beowulf's victory. The sorrow is prolonged in the scene at the mere, when the Danes despair of his success in the encounter with Grendel's mother and set out for Heorot. On the other hand, the Geats, bound by the ties of loyalty to their lord, remain gazing at the water without much hope and sick at heart. On the unexpected emergence of Beowulf they rejoice to see him safe and sound, and with Grendel's head on a pole, *ferhðum fægne*, they enter Hrothgar's hall. Quite apart from such contrasts in the story proper, the poet achieves a similar result by the introduction of episodes. Thus amid the revelry at the banquet after Grendel's overthrow Hrothgar's bard sings the lay of Finn and Hengest, a theme of feud and sorrow. Again in the scene at Hygelac's hall, when Beowulf and his men have returned in triumph, the mood changes while the story of Ingeld, with all its bitter enmity and vengeance, is related.

The sombre mood recurs most frequently in the relationship of Hrothgar and Beowulf to the people over whom they rule. Grief weighs heavily on the aged Danish king when, in spite of his warlike prowess, he can do nothing to keep Grendel at bay. The poem dwells on his suffering, anxiety, and despair: 'unbliðe sæt', 'þegnsorge dreah' (130–1),

> torn geþolode
> . . . weana gehwelcne,
> sidra sorga; (147–9)

'wræc micel', 'modes brecða' (170–1), 'bealuwa bisigu', 'cearwylmas' (281–2). The death of Æschere, his old comrade-in-arms, was a cause of peculiar sorrow to Hrothgar.[1] He felt this the more acutely because he was seventy or more.[2] Hence it is not surprising that at the last banquet at Heorot he should let his mind travel back to all that he had undergone, *gyrn æfter gomene* (1775), and that at the second banquet, in the very moment of rejoicing at the victory over Grendel, he should introduce a note of melancholy by lamenting his old age and failing strength:

> hwilum eft ongan eldo gebunden,
> gomel guðwiga gioguðe cwiðan
> hildestrengo; hreðer inne weoll,
> þonne he wintrum frod worn gemunde. (2111–14)

The poet went out of his way to emphasize Hrothgar's great age and physical weakness by making the Geats on the way from Heorot to their ship speak of this. To them he seemed a faultless king until old age deprived him of the joys of strength.

By the time that the dragon began his nocturnal raids, Beowulf was in much the same position as Hrothgar. He, too, had held sway for fifty years and was advanced in age (2208–10). The moment had come which Hrothgar had foreseen on the occasion of the third banquet at Heorot. It was with personal knowledge that he uttered his warning to Beowulf that the glory of his strength was but for a time and that the ways of losing it were manifold. Among these was the grasp of fire or dire old age, and he summed up with an anticipation of Beowulf's death:

> semninga bið,
> þæt ðec, dryhtguma, deað oferswyðeð. (1767–8)

In the second part of *Beowulf* there is a constant preoccupation with death. The hero himself meditates on the past and turns his thoughts to Hrethel, who brooded so much over the accidental slaying of his son that he died.[3] Arising out of this tragic theme is yet another grief-laden story, that of the old man whose son is hanged on the gallows. The passage (2455–62) culminates in Beowulf's comment, so poignant in its reticence: 'þuhte him eall to rum, wongas ond wicstede'. The father is the only survivor and so his home and his lands seem far too spacious. Beowulf's insight is appropriate, for he, too, is heirless, and shortly after, when he lies dying, he regrets that he has no son to whom he can bequeath his armour (2729–32).

[1] Cf. 1322–9 and 2129.

[2] Cf. 1769–70, where we learn that he had ruled the Danes for fifty years before Grendel's hostility began.

[3] This appears to be the meaning of 2469: 'gumdream ofgeaf, godes leoht geceas'.

The mood of these later passages is anticipated in the poet's relation of the burial of the hoard which the dragon afterwards guarded so jealously. All the owners but one have been carried off by their death; their abode is deserted. Soon death overtakes the last of the race when he has committed the treasure to the earth (2236–70).

From the moment that Beowulf hears that his hall has been burnt down, he is overcome by a melancholy that contrasts notably with his youthful confidence at Heorot. He is filled with gloomy thoughts, as was not his wont. He takes leave of his followers, and the poet leaves no doubt that the aged Beowulf's forebodings will soon come to pass:

> Him wæs geomor sefa,
> wæfre ond wælfus, wyrd ungemete neah,
> se ðone gomelan gretan sceolde,
> secean sawle hord, sundur gedælan
> lif wið lice. (2419–23)

Fate, as he tells Wiglaf after the fight with the dragon, has swept away his kinsmen to their death, and he must follow (2814–16).

The scenes which thus prepare the way for Beowulf's death contain some of the noblest lines in the poem. They are specially intended to throw light on the hero. Indirectly this is done also by the attitude of his followers. Even before the fray Wiglaf's mind is sad (2632), and the force of warriors that sits awaiting news of the struggle is mournful at heart (2894). After the report has reached them, they set off sorrowfully and with welling tears (3031–2). When the pyre has been raised, the King is placed in the middle by the lamenting warriors, and as the smoke ascends, 'Higum unrote modceare mændon mondryhtnes cwealm' (3148–9). Ten days later, when the mound has been completed, the solemn procession of Beowulf's retainers rides round it, bewailing their grief (3169–71). More is involved than the loss of a great ruler. Beowulf's death is a national disaster, and the messenger who carries the bad tidings is quick to foretell what they portend—invasion from abroad, captivity for the women, death in battle for the men (3016–27).

It is evident that the author of *Beowulf* constructed his poem in such a way that the end should recall the beginning, which tells how the other great hero, Scyld, passed away. At his own request Scyld is carried *to brimes faroðe* (28); at his own request Beowulf is placed in the mound *æt brimes nosan* (2803). The mourning of the followers of the Danish king is echoed by the dirge of those of the Geat. Yet there is a difference. Scyld, whose origin is enveloped in mystery, drifts away across the sea to a destination equally strange. But there is no such powerful impression as with Beowulf of national calamity and of dynastic extinction. Neither the

story of Scyld nor that of Beowulf is just an illustration of the path of glory leading to the grave. Yet the issues at stake are wider in scope and deeper in effect in the one than in the other, and the poet has endeavoured by various devices to impart a peculiar force and poignancy to the exploits and death of Beowulf.

He has no meticulous design, worked out with mathematical precision from start to finish. The three groups of opposites that have been examined are seen to intersect but not to coincide; and though they contribute to a fundamental unity, as the poem advances, with the deepening of the elegiac strain sorrow gets the upper hand, and all else is subordinate. It is significant that the lament of Hrothgar over his old age and growing weakness, though spoken on the occasion of the second banquet at Heorot, is introduced only in the latter half of *Beowulf*. Here is a notable diminution of festivity, and joy gives place to melancholy. The hero broods darkly over the misfortunes that have befallen him and his people. One last survivor after the other passes in sombre procession, and Fate hangs more and more heavily over all mankind. The word *geomor* and its derivatives echo at intervals[1] like a mournful bell, and the whole culminates in the dirge for the fall of a great king.

[1] *geomor* (2419, 2632, 3150); *geomorlic* (2444); *geomormod* (2044, 2267, 3018).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 'GARLANDE GAY' IN THE ALLEGORY OF *PEARL*

By IAN BISHOP

'O perle', quod I, 'of rych renoun,
So wat3 hit me dere þat þou con deme
In þis veray avysyoun!
If hit be ueray and soth sermoun
Þat þou so styke3 in garlande gay,
So wel is me in þys doel-doungoun
Þat þou art to þat Prynse3 paye.'[1]

I. *The Crux in line 1186*

IN E. V. Gordon's edition of *Pearl* the traditional interpretation of l. 1186 is rejected in favour of one that has been proposed by Sister Mary Vincent Hillman.[2] Whereas the older interpretation would identify the *garlande* with the *coroune* that is described as the maiden's head-dress at ll. 205–8,[3] the new edition (p. 85), following Sister Hillman, suggests that it represents metaphorically the heavenly procession in which the maiden had appeared to the dreamer at l. 1147. The earlier interpretation relies upon the fact that *garlande* was used as a vernacular equivalent of *corona*, not only in the sense of a 'wreath' or 'chaplet of flowers', but also when a crown of gold was meant: Sister Hillman bases her interpretation upon a figurative use of the word *ghirlanda* in *Paradiso*, x. 91–93, and again in xii. 19–20. The principal objection to the older interpretation is that it necessarily involves the emendation of MS. *styke3* to *st*[*r*]*yke3*: the chief merit of Sister Hillman's is that it retains *styke3* as an intransitive verb with the meaning '[you] are set'.

From such a comparison of the two interpretations it seems reasonable to conclude that the new edition is amply justified in its preference for Sister Hillman's suggestion. Nevertheless, a closer examination of the evidence upon which her interpretation is based reveals a certain weakness in her position. Dante does not, in fact, apply the word *ghirlanda* to any heavenly procession, nor does he use it to describe anything so vague as a generalized 'circle of the blessed'. His application of the word is local and specific; it arises almost spontaneously from its immediate context. When Dante and Beatrice reach the Sphere of the Sun, they suddenly find them-

[1] *Pearl*, ll. 1182–8. Quotations are from E. V. Gordon's edition (Oxford, 1953).
[2] *M.L.N.*, lx (1945), 224.
[3] See the editions by Sir Israel Gollancz (London, 1921), pp. 172–3, and C. G. Osgood (Boston, 1906), pp. 96–97.

selves encircled by the souls of the philosophers and theologians, who are the inhabitants of that sphere. In order to describe this particular phenomenon more concretely and vividly, the poet employs a number of varied metaphors. In spite of their variety, these metaphors have one thing in common: each of them embodies the idea of circularity. It is as one of these metaphors that the image of the *ghirlanda*, to which Sister Hillman refers, is introduced. This use of the word does not provide a very substantial precedent for the identification of the *garlande* in *Pearl* with the procession of the 144,000 virgins who follow the Lamb; for one thing, it is difficult to see how that procession could be regarded as circular. Another difficulty lies in the fact that Dante describes this circle of souls as a *ghirlanda* of flowers, but the English poet is obviously not thinking of the maiden as a flower, since he addresses her as '. . . perle . . . of rych renoun . . .'.[1] That may not be a very serious discrepancy in itself, but it hardly tends to increase one's confidence in the validity of the alleged parallel.

In spite of these objections, I believe that Sister Hillman's citation of this passage from Dante has been profitable in so far as it has afforded a provisional basis for her attractive suggestion that *stykeȝ* may be retained if the *garlande* is interpreted metaphorically. But it seems to me that, if this suggestion is to be substantiated and developed further, it is vain to rely upon the passage in the *Paradiso*; one must look for evidence elsewhere. We may take our leave of Dante's *ghirlanda* by observing that it may differ from the *garlande* in *Pearl* in yet another respect. For this *ghirlanda* is simply a pattern that is made by the flowers (or souls); without them there would be no *ghirlanda*. The *garlande* in *Pearl* may be formed out of gems in a similar fashion; but there is another possibility. The *garlande* may be an object that is capable of existing quite independently of any pearls that are 'stuck' in it as ornaments: the poet may be using the word in the sense of 'a (golden) crown'.[2] If, at the same time, he is speaking metaphorically or allegorically, the *garlande* in which the pearl *stykeȝ* is most likely to represent the place where the maiden dwells in perpetual security:[3] that is, presumably, the New Jerusalem.

[1] Sister Hillman attempts to reinforce her argument by calling to her aid a number of passages in the *Paradiso* where souls are represented as gems, and even as pearls. But these passages are irrelevant; they make no difference to Dante's use of the word *ghirlanda*.

[2] See *O.E.D.* under *Garland*, sb., 2. This is, of course, the sense in which the word is taken by Gollancz and Osgood. But my conception of the relationship between the pearl and the crown differs radically from theirs.

[3] *O.E.D.* cites this occurrence of *stykeȝ* as an example of *Stick*, v.[1], 5: (Of things) 'to be fastened in position; to be fastened in or as in a socket; to be attached'. This is clearly the sense of the word here, in so far as it is used of the material gem. But the *perle* is a person as well as a thing, and in ME. the verb was also used intransitively of persons, with the meaning 'to continue or remain persistently in a place' (*O.E.D.*, sense 6).

One of the seventeenth-century examples of sense 5 affords a remarkable parallel to l. 1186: 'We shall stick like Pearls in the Crowns of the Twelve Apostles' (Bunyan, *Holy Citie*).

It is the purpose of the present article to show that there are good reasons for believing that this is the correct interpretation. In the first place, I shall try to show that such an interpretation not only suits the immediate context admirably, but also fits neatly into the allegorical scheme of the poem as a whole. Secondly, there is substantial external evidence to support this interpretation: for the New Jerusalem was frequently represented in the ecclesiastical art of the time as a kind of golden *garlande* or crown. Moreover, these ecclesiastical *coronae* had pearls, or precious stones, set in them as symbols of the virtuous souls who inhabit the Heavenly City. But before I discuss this remarkable piece of symbolism, I shall consider what can be deduced from internal evidence alone.

II. *The Allegory of the Ideal Setting for the Pearl*

In the first eight lines of the poem the author makes use of a number of the stock phrases and conventional formulas of certain medieval verse lapidaries.[1] Three of these conventions can be seen in the two opening lines of the poem:

> Perle, plesaunte to prynces paye
> To clanly clos in golde so clere . . . .[2]

In the first place, it was a convention that each set of verses in the lapidary should have as its first word the name of the precious stone that was to be discussed. Secondly, it was not unusual to declare that such a gem was worthy to be the prized possession of a king or prince. Finally, there was often a reference to the proper setting for the gem; in almost every instance, gold was considered to be the ideal setting.

The author evidently expected his readers to recognize the peculiar literary genre to which these lines belong so that they might appreciate the 'conceits' which, later in the poem, are developed from these stereotyped phrases. An obvious example of such a 'conceit' occurs at l. 1188, where the first line of the poem is recapitulated, but with a specific allegorical meaning: having learnt from his vision that the lost child has become a bride of Christ, the dreamer rejoices in the knowledge that this pearl (whom he had once selfishly regarded as his own property) is now 'to þat Prynseȝ paye'. The use of the familiar lapidary formula helps to emphasize the fact that Christ, and not the dreamer, has always been the pearl's rightful owner.

It is perhaps not so obvious that the conventional allusion, in l. 2, to the

[1] See W. H. Schofield in *P.M.L.A.*, xxiv (1909), 600–6.

[2] On the syntax of these lines, see Gordon, p. 45. Gordon remarks that they 'are probably not an apostrophe'. A comparison with the opening lines of the lapidary verses confirms this view: the poet is simply using the lapidary formula in the manner of a rhetorical 'topic'—a point of departure for his argument that would be familiar to his readers.

ideal setting for the pearl is also worked into the allegory. There is no verbal recapitulation of this line, but the relationship between the pearl and its setting becomes a theme of some importance, which is developed allegorically as the poem proceeds.[1] The development begins in the second stanza of the poem, where the author is speaking allegorically of the child's death and burial. He laments that his pearl lies in the ground, covered with earth; he mourns 'hir color so clad in clot' (when it should be set 'in golde so clere'). In ll. 23–24 he reproaches this unworthy and unsympathetic 'setting':

> O moul, þou marre3 a myry iuele,
> My priuy perle wythouten spotte.

In the course of his dream, the maiden tells him that he is mistaken in thinking in this way about the fate of his pearl, for she is, in reality, safely locked up in a 'cofer' or 'forser', namely, the 'gardyn gracios gaye' of Paradise.[2] Yet a pearl that is locked away in a treasure-chest cannot be said to be displayed in its ideal setting. However, this is only an intermediate stage in the development of the metaphor. At ll. 917 ff. the dreamer asks the maiden whether there are 'no wone3 in castel-walle', no 'gret cité', where she, and the other brides of the Lamb, have their abode. For—as he exclaims—

> So cumly a pakke of joly juele
> Wer euel don schulde ly3 þeroute. (929–30)

The maiden responds to his question by directing him to a place from which he can see the New Jerusalem. It is significant that, in the description of the Heavenly City that follows, emphasis is placed upon gold and light, thus providing a background against which the immaculate whiteness of the maiden and her pearl-adorned companions shows up to advantage. It seems that the pearl has indeed been placed in a setting of 'golde so clere'.

But at this point the author does not make any *explicit* reference to the metaphor of the proper setting for the pearl; the maiden is presented simply as 'my lyttel quene . . . þat wat3 so quyt' (1147–50). The actual announcement that the pearl has been placed in a setting which the dreamer evidently regards as ideal for her is postponed until l. 1186, where, reflecting upon what has just been revealed to him in his 'veray avysyoun', he rejoices in the knowledge that she 'so styke3 in garlande gay'.

The reason for the postponement of the announcement is clear enough: the poet wishes this final stage in the development of the metaphor, which had its origin in the lapidary formula in l. 2, to coincide with the re-

[1] Another of the opening lines that is echoed later in the poem is l. 6. As l. 6, this line describes the material gem; at l. 190 it is adapted to the description of the maiden whom the pearl represents figuratively.

[2] See ll. 257–64, and the whole of the following stanza.

capitulation of l. 1 that occurs at l. 1188. The double allusion to the poem's opening lines emphasizes the fact that the argument, in so far as it is concerned with the fortunes of the child and the dreamer's changing attitude towards them, has come full circle (the two remaining stanzas merely form a kind of epilogue that is concerned with the poem's moral *sentence*). If I am right in thinking that l. 1186 corresponds in this way to l. 2, the *garlande gay* must be an object that provides the pearl with a setting 'in golde so clere'; in other words, it would have to be a golden crown, and not the kind of garland that Sister Hillman appears to have in mind. This seems to confirm what the other circumstantial evidence has suggested: the *garlande* represents the New Jerusalem, not the procession.

Yet this would remain a conjecture, were it not for the independent testimony of the external evidence, to which I have already referred. It is unfortunate that, although this piece of symbolism was evidently a commonplace in the ecclesiastical art of the period, there does not exist (as far as I know) any adequate and readily accessible account of it for the reader to consult. Most of the necessary information has to be extracted from medieval texts and from the miscellanies and footnotes of nineteenth-century antiquaries. I have therefore assembled in the following pages as much of the available information on this unfamiliar subject as is relevant to the present discussion.

III. *The Ecclesiastical* Corona *and the New Jerusalem*

Of the various special applications of the word *corona* that are listed by Du Cange, the one which at first sight appears least likely to have any relevance for the present discussion is that which makes it the name of a kind of ecclesiastical chandelier.[1] Yet I believe that these chandeliers are capable of illuminating the meaning of *Pearl*, l. 1186. The practice of hanging in churches chandeliers made in the form of a crown was already well established by the eleventh century.[2] They originally consisted of a small frame, in the form of a crown, from which one or more oil lamps were

[1] In addition to the article on *Corona*, see his definition of its diminutive, *Coronula*: 'parva corona seu parvum candelabrum in modum coronae'.

[2] Most of the available information about *coronae* is scattered throughout the publications of various nineteenth-century French antiquaries; a little can also be gleaned from some English ecclesiologists. See Charles Cahier and Arthur Martin, *Mélanges d'Archéologie* (Paris, 1853), iii. 1–62: 'Couronne de Lumière d'Aix-la-Chapelle, et monuments analogues du Moyen Age' (by C. Cahier); Henri René D'Allemagne, *Histoire du Luminaire* (Paris, 1891), pp. 63–72, 85–101, 124–6. See also Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné du mobilier français* (Paris, 1858), i. 142–51 (under *Lampesier*). For an account of the *coronae* at Hildesheim, see De Caumont, *Bulletin Monumental* (Paris, 1854), xx. 289–95; for an account of *coronae* in England in the Anglo-Saxon period, see Daniel Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, new edn. by G. W. Hart and W. H. Frere (London, 1904), i. 157–61 (esp. p. 157, n. 10, and p. 161, n. 17). See also J. D. Chambers, *Divine Worship in England* (London, 1877), pp. 4–5, 292, 293.

suspended. They were usually hung over an altar. By the twelfth century, however, much larger examples were being fashioned, such as those which were installed at Cologne, Hildesheim, Rheims, Bayeux, and Aachen; these carried a number of lamps and were also fitted with rows of holders for candles. A *corona* at Hildesheim, for example, carried twelve lamps and seventy-two candles.[1] These larger examples were hung from the vault of the choir or nave and must have been one of the most conspicuous ornaments in the church. Both the smaller and the larger types are usually described as 'golden' whenever they are mentioned in contemporary documents, although metals of various kinds were used in their construction.[2] They were usually set with precious stones and decorated with flower tracery wrought in metal (thus making the word *garlande* applicable to them in more senses than one). The favourite ornament seems to have been the *cordons* of pearls that ran round the exterior of the gilded circle or formed a kind of border to the flower tracery.

The symbolic significance of the *corona* is clearly stated by the twelfth-century liturgical commentator Honorius (usually known as 'Honorius of Autun'), who finds allegories in every part of a church, and in almost every object which it contains, from the crypt to the weather-cock:

> *Corona* ob tres causas in templo suspenditur: una quod ecclesia per hoc decoratur, cum ejus luminibus illuminatur; alia quod ejus visione admonemur quia hi coronam vitae et lumen gaudii percipiunt, qui hic Deo devote serviunt; tertia ut *coelestis Hierusalem* nobis ad memoriam revocetur, ad cujus figuram facta videtur. . . .[3]

The significance of the remark with which this quotation ends becomes apparent as soon as one looks at an illustration of one of the larger *coronae*.[4]

[1] De Caumont, p. 290.

[2] See Victor Mortet, *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire de l'architecture en France au Moyen Age, XI^e–XII^e siècles* (Paris, 1911), pp. 118, 140, 218, 310, 368; Victor Mortet and Paul Deschamps, *Recueil de textes, &c., XII^e–XIII^e siècles* (Paris, 1929), pp. 71 and 214: Cahier, *passim*; D'Allemagne, loc. cit. In addition, see the full text of the description by Honorius, from which extracts are given below (p. 18).

[3] J. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, clxxii, col. 588. Part of this chapter is quoted in Mortet and Deschamps, op. cit., pp. 16–17. They give a useful list of works on *coronae*, and references to secondary sources on the symbolism of the *corona* as the New Jerusalem (p. 16, nn. 4, 5; p. 17, nn. 1, 2).

[4] The clearest and most detailed illustrations are those of the *corona* at Aachen in Cahier, Pls. 3–11. Pl. 12 reproduces a drawing from a sixteenth-century MS. of the one which formerly hung at Rheims. Smaller and less detailed illustrations can be found in De Caumont, Viollet-le-Duc, and D'Allemagne. For illustrations of the earlier and simpler types in their various forms, see Cahier, Pl. 2, and pp. 19, 25–28, 30–32. Chambers, op. cit., reproduces an illustration from the Utrecht Psalter of a *corona* hanging over an altar (facing p. 2) and the illustration from Cahier, p. 30 (facing p. 5).

With the exception of those from Hildesheim and Aachen, these illustrations are taken from representations in stained-glass windows, bas-reliefs, sculptures, and MSS. D'Allemagne, Pl. 5, shows the *corona* of Aachen hanging beneath the dome of the church (this illustration indicates the great size of the ornament).

For the lamps were placed in miniature towers, designed to look like those spaced at intervals, usually over the gates, around the circuit of a city wall; the basic circle of the *corona* represents the city wall itself. The nineteenth-century antiquary Charles Cahier has shown how, in spite of its circular form, the *corona* faithfully represents the fact that the New Jerusalem has four walls with three gates in each wall (*Revelation* xxi. 13).[1]

Honorius is not content to indicate this self-evident symbolical function of the chandelier as a whole; he proceeds to find allegorical meanings for all its constituent parts. Thus, the various metals of which it is made are said to represent the different orders (martyrs, virgins, &c.) among the citizens. He even provides allegorical interpretations for the towers, the lights and—what is of particular interest in the present argument—for the precious stones that are set in the *corona*:

> *Turres* coronae sunt scriptis Ecclesiam munientes; *lucernae* ejus bonis actibus lucentes.... *Gemmae* in corona coruscantes sunt qui et in virtutibus rutilantes....

That this is no mere personal quirk on the part of a man who was addicted to hunting for allegories in every stone and cobweb of a church is proved by the inscriptions on the *coronae* themselves, which offer similarly detailed interpretations. Some of these inscriptions run to a considerable length; the longest of all being the one from Bayeux, which amounts to nearly fifty lines of Latin verse.[2] Almost all of them include a reference to the symbolic significance of the precious stones.[3] It is also interesting to observe that every one of the inscriptions whose text is extant contains the words *visio pacis*—the commonest medieval 'etymology' of the name *Jerusalem*. This 'etymology' is mentioned in *Pearl*, ll. 950–2; but this fact in itself cannot be regarded as evidence that the poet was familiar with such inscriptions, as there are so many other contexts from which he could have taken it.

In addition to this purely symbolic representation of the inhabitants of the Heavenly City, the larger *coronae* provided a more 'realistic' one. Statuettes of the Apostles were placed in niches in the towers to guard the city gates. Sometimes the statuettes were of the Prophets or of the Elders of the Apocalypse.[4] There were also medallions representing Archangels, Angels, Virtues, and personifications of the Eight Beatitudes.[5] This 'realism' appears to have been carried to extremes in the *corona* which

[1] Op. cit., pp. 41–43. See especially the diagram on p. 62 which illustrates the geometric principles on which the *corona* is constructed.

[2] A reconstruction of the text of this inscription by Henri Oresme is printed as the appendix to the preface in Léopold Delisle, *Chronique de Robert de Torigni* (Rouen, 1872), I. lxvii–lxxi.

[3] For text of the inscription from the *corona* which was installed towards the end of the eleventh century at Cologne, see Cahier, p. 57, n. 3. For text of the inscription on that at Aachen, p. 38, n. 3; for the one at Hildesheim, De Caumont, p. 291, and D'Allemagne, p. 92.

[4] D'Allemagne, p. 97.

[5] Cahier, pp. 45–49.

hung in Worcester Cathedral throughout the twelfth century. Baudri of Bourgueil has left some verses concerning this remarkable object, which is described as follows in his title: *De corona ejusdem ecclesiae in qua sunt xii turres, in quibus sunt imagines arte mechanica se moventes et quasi exsilientes.*[1] The figures were of the twelve Apostolic sentries, and the mechanism appears to have operated a representation of the changing of the celestial guard. Unfortunately, it perished in the fire that destroyed the cathedral in 1202.[2] The other examples that are mentioned in the text and notes of the present article were more fortunate; some of them survived until the sixteenth century at least. The one at Aachen has survived until the present century, although many of its ornaments and decorations disappeared long ago. The available evidence suggests that the *corona* (either in the form of these larger examples or as a small golden garland set with pearls) must have been a fairly common sight in the larger churches of Western Europe, including England, during the twelfth century and throughout the later Middle Ages.

It is worth remarking that, if there is, indeed, an allusion to this kind of *corona* in *Pearl*, l. 1186, it would not be the only one in a vernacular poem of the fourteenth century. Cahier believes that Dante had such an object in mind when describing the Heavenly Rose in *Paradiso* xxx and xxxi.[3] He shows how the *corona* at Aachen, when looked at from below, gives the impression of a great golden flower in which the medallions of the heavenly citizens are set,[4] and he associates it with the Golden Rose that the Pope displays on the Fourth Sunday in Lent. The Liturgy for that day is devoted entirely to the celebration of the joys of the New Jerusalem; according to Pope Innocent III[5] and Durandus of Mende,[6] this rose symbolizes the Beatific Vision or the peace that is to be enjoyed in the Heavenly City.[7] It is significant that in *Paradiso* xxx and xxxi the image of the rose is continually being metamorphosed into another image (a kingdom, a court, a city, and a garden), while there is a direct allusion to the Apocalyptic description of the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem at xxx. 129: *quanto è 'l convento delle bianche stole.* It is in the *corona* that all these fleeting

[1] Text from *Les Œuvres poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil*, ed. Phyllis Abrahams (Paris, 1926), no. ccliv. The editor dates this poem *c.* 1120–30. See also Léopold Delisle, 'Notes sur les poésies de B. de B.', *Romania*, i (1872), 23–50.

[2] Abrahams, ed. cit., p. 360.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 38–39.

[4] This is because the *corona* is in the form of a circle with eight lobes, giving the impression of a flower with eight golden petals. This impression is enhanced by the pattern made by the supporting chains and by the fact that the medallions look down at the observer from a horizontal position above his head. The effect is well illustrated in Cahier's Pl. 4.

[5] *Sermo* xviii, 'Dominica Laetare, sive De Rosa' (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, ccxvii, coll. 393–8).

[6] *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, vi. liii. 9 and 10.

[7] See, in addition, the verses by Baudri of Bourgueil, 'De Rosa Aurea' (ed. cit., no. cxiv).

images are represented simultaneously: the city is obviously represented, while the idea of the kingdom and court is implicit in the figure of the crown; the garden is probably symbolized by the flower embroidery.[1] It seems to me, however, that the clearest allusion to the *corona* occurs in xxx. 100 ff.:

> Lume è là su che visibile face
> Lo creatore a quella creatura
> che solo in lui vedere ha la sua pace.
> E si distende in circular figura,
> in tanto che la sua circonferenza
> sarebbe al sol troppo larga cintura.

The way in which even the *visio pacis* 'etymology' is woven into this particular context makes Cahier's argument remarkably convincing.[2]

The evidence that has been assembled in these few pages should be enough to justify the assertion that the *corona* must have afforded the most striking visual representation of the New Jerusalem that was known in the Middle Ages. As it shimmered and 'blysned al bri3t', suspended in mid-air, it must have given a vivid impression of the city which St. John saw descending from Heaven. The effect that it could have upon the mind of a poet who was looking for concrete metaphors to describe the joys of Heaven is evident from the way in which it appears to have stimulated Dante's imagination. If the author of *Pearl* had ever seen one,[3] he would,

[1] For the idea that flowers or leaves, adorning a golden crown, represent the garden of Paradise, see the comment by Honorius on 1 Cor. ix. 25 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, clxxii, col. 857).

[2] It is interesting to observe that the introduction of the image of the *ghirlanda* (at x. 91–93), to which Sister Hillman refers, is the result of a somewhat similar process of metamorphosis. When the souls of the theologians first appear (ll. 64–65), they are represented as lights that form a *corona* (i.e. a circle) around Beatrice and Dante. In the subsequent lines this image undergoes various transformations. Although there may be an oblique allusion to the ecclesiastical *corona* here, it is certainly not made to act as the basis of the metaphorical variation in this passage in the way that it does in Canto xxx. Indeed, the basis of the variation here appears to be semasiological rather than iconographical. What Dante does is to substitute synonyms for various special connotations of the word *corona*. The whole passage should be compared with Du Cange's article on this word.

[3] As evidence for the existence of *coronae* in England after the Conquest, there is the poem of Baudri (see p. 19) and the statements by Gervase of Canterbury concerning the golden *coronae* which hung in Canterbury Cathedral in the twelfth century (quoted in Mortet, pp. 213 and 218). D'Allemagne (p. 125) quotes an item from an inventory of St. Paul's, London, dated 1295, which mentions *unus circulus ferreus florigeratus, appensus ante eandem* [*crucem*] *in quo pendet una lampas*—but this is not of the type with which we are principally concerned. Chambers (p. 5) says that at Sarum, in the thirteenth century, a corona of lights hung over the choir—but he does not mention the source of his information. However, such an object is mentioned in the Sarum Consuetudinary, among the instructions about lights: *Et in corona ante altare* [but two other MSS. read *ante gradum chori*] *sex* [*cereos*] *unumquemque dimidie libre ad minus, et sex super murum*

no doubt, have found it difficult to keep such an object out of his mind when writing a poem that has a description of the New Jerusalem as its climax. He does not introduce any allusion to it into the actual description (which follows closely the text of the Apocalypse), but the symbolism of the *corona* provides him with an apt and felicitous way of translating the sublime subject of that description into terms of the simple lapidary formulas, with which the poem began, and to which it returns when the argument comes full circle in ll. 1182–8.

post pulpitum lectionum. (W. H. Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i (Cambridge, 1898), 4.) See also p. 6: [*Praeterea*] *ad matutinas tres in corona et tres post pulpitum.* In addition, a number of the representations of *coronae* in manuscripts, stained-glass windows, and bas-reliefs, which Cahier reproduces, are English.

I have not yet found any direct evidence of the existence of *coronae* in England during the fourteenth century, but the evidence given in the last paragraph is enough to show that the practice of hanging *coronae* in churches was established in England before the beginning of the century. The practice was probably far more widespread than this small number of references, in documents that have chanced to survive, might suggest; and it is quite possible that *coronae* were still to be seen in some English churches in the fourteenth century. They certainly survived on the Continent until a much later date, and, as nothing is known about the author of *Pearl*, the possibility of his having seen them in French churches cannot be excluded.

THE WORLD OF THE BALLAD

By PATRICIA INGHAM

THE finest of the English and Scottish ballads, such as 'Earl Brand' (7),[1] 'Clerk Saunders' (69), 'The Wife of Usher's Well' (79), and 'Lamkin' (93), are at once the most tragic and the most pagan. The two facts are not unrelated; the absence of religious themes is, in part, the reason for the ballad's tragic force. Religious subjects do occur, but rarely—e.g. 'The Carnal and the Crane' (55), 'The Cherry Tree Carol' (54), 'Dives and Lazarus' (56), 'St. Stephen and Herod' (22), and 'Sir Hugh' (155). Besides being rare these subjects are as out of place in the ballad world as the christianizing of 'Thomas Rhymer' (37), where the hero confuses the Queen of Elfland with the 'Queen o' Heaven'.

The paganism of the classic ballad is a commonplace, but neither its precise nature nor the imaginative effect of this has been fully analysed. It has been noted that in the English and Scottish ballad a magical power takes the place of the supernatural: the unknown home of this power is that to which Tamlin (39), Thomas Rhymer (37), or the Queen of Elfan's Nourice (40) is carried away. It can be diverted to the purposes of the stepmother who wishes to turn brother and sister into a 'laily' worm and a 'machrel' of the sea respectively (36), or to the purpose of saving the girl in 'Broomfield Hill' (43). Linked to this magic is the animism which dominates the ballads. Not only is a man's spirit seen from 'Lamkin' (93) and 'The Twa Sisters' (10) to reside in his blood or bones, but as part of the same animistic beliefs animals are endowed with speech. Wimberley[2] regards this as a relic of the ancient belief in the bird or animal soul shared by most primitive peoples. True, many traces of paganism in the ballads clearly belong to a common European tradition and to early nature cults. But it also seems clear, especially since Odin undoubtedly appears in some ballads, that they have definite affinities with the literature of the Germanic heroic world. They mirror a universe closely resembling that found in some Old Norse poetry and in *Beowulf*. Not only are there traces of specifically Old Norse beliefs, but even those pagan beliefs which belong to a common European tradition are used in the English and Scottish ballads in a way similar to that of Old Norse literature.

[1] The numbers given after the names of ballads are those in F. J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Boston and New York, 1882–98).

[2] L. C. Wimberley, *Folklore in the English and Scottish Ballads* (Chicago, 1928), p. 44.

Animistic beliefs certainly existed outside Europe, but it is significant, as York Powell[1] says, that in both eddic lays and ballads it is birds that have the power of speech while 'other beasts have lost their primeval powers in this direction'. So in the *Helga-Kviða* at the opening of the story of Helgi and Sigrún we hear how one raven spoke to another of the young Helgi's prowess, while in the story of Helgi and Svava, Atli, sent by Hiorward to woo Sigrlind, is helped by a talking bird. In the ballads, besides the one talking horse in 'Broomfield Hill' (43), talking birds occur in all the following ballads: 'Lady Isabel and the Elf Knight' (4c), 'Three Ravens' (26), 'Broomfield Hill' (43a), 'Child Waters' (63h), 'Young Hunting' (68a), 'The Bonnie Birdie' (82), 'The Gay Goshawk' (96), and 'Johnie Cock' (114f).

Similarly the idea that a man's spirit is lodged in some particular part of him is in keeping with Norse beliefs. Moreover, it is significant that the localization of this particular spot in his name, which is frequently implied by the English and Scottish ballads, is found more than once in Norse literature. A trace of it occurs in the version of 'Erlinton' (8b), in which the hero adjures his mistress not to change her 'cheer' until she sees his body bleed. It is only when she speaks his name, as she does in three out of Child's five versions of the closely related ballad 'Earl Brand', that his enemy is able to strike the fatal blow. The original version is made clear by the often-quoted Scandinavian parallel 'Ribold and Guldborg':

> And though my blood run red,
> My name must not be said.
>
> Yea though thou see me fall,
> My name thou must not call . . . .
>
> E'en as she spoke the fatal word
> Wounded was he with many a sword.[2]

Even closer to this is the American version collected by Campbell and Sharp:

> She got down and never spoke
> Nor never cheaped,
> Till she saw her own father's head
> Come trinkling by her feet.[3]

[1] Vigfusson and York Powell, *Corpus Poeticum Boreale* (Oxford, 1883), i. 507.

[2] Axel Olrik, *Danske Folkeviser* (Copenhagen, 1909), pp. 8–9:

> Om du ser mig bløde,
> du nævn mig ikke til Døde.
>
> Om du ser mig falde,
> du nævn mig ikke med alle.
>
> Alt udi det samme Mal
> fik han Fyrretyve Saar.

Tr. E. M. Smith-Dampier, *Book of Danish Ballads* (Princeton, 1939), pp. 248–50.

[3] Olive D. Campbell and Cecil Sharp, *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians* (New York, 1917), p. 11.

The same belief is implicit in Child Water's command to Faire Ellen who wishes to be his page:

> You must tell noe man what is my name,
> My ffootpage then you shall be. (63a)

and when in 'The Hunting of the Cheviot' (162a) Percy answers Douglas's challenge with:

> 'We wyll not tell the whoys men we ar', he says,
> 'Nor whos men we be.'

he is perhaps echoing Sigurd's reply to the serpent Fafnir: 'ætt mín er mǫnnum ókunnig'.[1]

The scene of the ballad can thus be localized: it is set firmly in the 'medill erthe' of Thomas of Ersseldoune,[2] the 'middlarf' of 'Sweet William's Ghost' (77b), the 'middle earth' of 'Sir Cawline' (61), within the encircling body of Midgardsorm. Its gods are those of the Elder Edda: Odin and his companions, who hold out no hope of an eternal happiness. There is, indeed, a surviving fragment of a Shetland ballad which, although the figure concerned is clearly Christ, has definite connexions with Odin's hanging:

> Nine days he hung pa de rütless tree,[3]
> for ill wis da folk in' güd wis he.

The same god frequently wanders across the ballad scene disguised as an old man. Child's research revealed his identity in several instances, though perhaps not all. He found enough, however, to show that the god of disguises appears more than once in both his malign and benevolent aspects. For the sake of completeness I repeat Child's argument.

According to him the clearest indication of Odin's presence is found in 'Earl Brand' (7) and the closely allied 'Erlinton' (8); but as in 'Harbardsljód' the grey-beard is never specifically revealed as Odin, so in the ballad 'ald Carl Hood' is shown as nothing more than a malicious ancient who betrays the elopement of Earl Brand and his mistress to her father. It is the Norse parallel in the story of Helgi Hundingsbana[4] which, as Child shows, gives the clue. There the disguised Helgi is similarly betrayed to his enemies by a mysterious blind man called *Blindr enn bolvisi* ('Blind, the evil-witted'),

[1] Ernst Wilken, *Die Prosaische Edda* (Paderborn, 1912), i. 179.

[2] Child, i. 327.

[3] Published by Karl Blind in Paul Lindau's *Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1874), p. 20. The fragment in full is:

> Nine days he hung pa de rütless tree,
> for ill wis da folk in' güd wis he.
> A blüdy mæl/mæt wis in his side,
> made wi' a lance, 'at wid na hide.
> Nine lang nichts i' da nippin rime
> hang he dare wi' his naeked limb,
> Some dey leuch
> bitt idders gred.

[4] 'Völsungakvida hin forna': F. Jónsson, *Sæmundar Edda* (Reykjavík, 1926), p. 249.

who is found in the related *Hromunds Saga* as *blindr inn illi* ('Blind the bad') and the *karlinn blindr er hat bavis* ('the Carl Blind surnamed Bavis'). Both are clearly identical with the 'blind one-eyed man of many tales who goes about in various disguises, sometimes as a beggar with his hood or hat slouched over his face—that is Odin the Síðhöttr or Deep-Hood of Saemund'.[1] The connexion between this malicious blind Odin and the Carl Hood of 'Earl Brand' is confirmed by the use of the simple name 'Hood' in *Halfs Saga* where we are told explicitly: *Höttr er Odinn var reyndar*.[2] The figure in 'Earl Brand' is Odin in his malicious form, when 'He's ay for ill but he's never for good'.

Child does not notice that not all ballads name their unexplained malicious old men. Yet such characters are frequent. In 'Johnie Cock' (114a) there appears

> . . . an old palmer,
> And an ill death may he die,

who for no reason betrays Johnie to his enemies; in 'The Twa Magicians' (44) a coal-black smith whose magical and amorous pursuit recalls Odin; in 'Sir Patrick Spens' (58a) the malicious 'eldern knight' who does the ill-deed to the hero; and in 'Young Benjie' (85b) a mysterious 'auld woman' who 'As she was passing by' told Maisry's brothers to raise her spirit:

> Ask of your sister what you want
> And she will speak to thee.

In his more benign aspect Odin was revealed by Child in at least four ballads. As he says, the two sides of the god's character may be represented by the *bil-eygr* and *bol-eygr* of *Grimnismál* (47), which may mean 'weak-eyed' and 'fiery-eyed' respectively. The evil side of the god's character then is the *karlinn blindr er hat bavis* of *Hromunds Saga* and the *blindr inn bolvisi* of the second lay of Helgi Hundingsbana from which much of the saga is taken. This figure is the antecedent of the Billie Blind who appears as a helpful household spirit in 'Gil Brenton' (5c) (Billie Blin), 'Willie's Lady' (6) (Belly Blind), 'Young Beichan' (53c) (Belly Blin), and 'The Knight and the Shepherd's Daughter' (110d, e) (Belly-Blind, Billy Blin). Child thinks that 'originally . . . perhaps only the bad member of this mythical pair was blind, but it would not be at all strange that later tradition should transfer blindness to the good-natured one and give rise to the anomalous Billie Blind'.[3] But although blindness is mentioned only in reference to a malevolent Odin in the Norse instances cited by Child, there is nothing in Norse literature which specifically indicates that only the malicious manifestation of the god is blind. However, in the Burlow Beanie, the seven-headed monster of

[1] Child, i. 95.
[2] G. Jónsson, *Fornaldar Sögur Norðurlanda* (Reykjavík, 1950), p. 95.
[3] i. 67.

'King Arthur and King Cornwall' (30), if Child's view is correct, there remains a trace of the original malicious *bol-eygr*. But the 'lodly groome' in the 'rub chandler' looks like a later grafting on to the earlier conception of the Billie Blind.

Thus Odin *bol-eygr* and *bil-eygr* is found in the ballad world, and oftener perhaps than Child thought. For it was he who opposed Kuhn's[1] view that Robin Hood, the hero of the later ballads, could be traced back to 'Woden' under his benign and even playful aspect. But his own identification of Carl Hood as Odin casts doubt on his denial. *Halfs Saga* tells us plainly, *Höttr er Oðin var reyndar*, and Robin Hood has the same claim to the name as the old man in 'Earl Brand'. Indeed the half-magical fighting powers of the hero and his emphatic invincibility make it quite likely that this is yet another survival of Odin the *sidhottr*, although his identity was more rapidly obscured than 'old Carl Hood's'.

But the presence of Odin is more than an isolated fact: he is in the Edda the god who presides over a very particular kind of universe, and it is this which we find in the English and Scottish ballads. For Odin is no eternal god but one who, like the heroes Ingeld and Beowulf, and like Earl Brand and Clerk Saunders, is doomed to die.

Thus the people of the ballads, like those of the eddic lays and some of the sagas, are doomed. Often the atmosphere of the ballad, like that of the lays, is charged with a sense of imminent catastrophe. Hence the significance of the fact that when it was time for the three dead sons of the Wife of Usher's Well to return to the grave:

> Up then crew the red, red, cock,
> And up and crew the grey,
> The eldest to the youngest said,
> 'Tis time we were away. (79a)

This cock, which is usually black in the Scandinavian ballads, is an echo of the hell-cock who will signal the approach of the *ragna-rǫk*:

> Then to the gods crowed Gollinkambi,
> He wakes the heroes in Othinn's hall,
> And beneath the earth does another crow,
> The soot red bird at the bars of hell.[2]

[1] A. Kuhn, 'Wodan', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, v (1845), 472.

[2] H. A. Bellows, *The Poetic Edda* (Oxford, 1923), p. 19. Völuspá 42: F. Jónsson, op. cit., p. 12:

> Gól of ásum
> Gollinkambi,
> sá vekr hölða
> at Herjaföðrs,
> en annarr gól
> fyr jörð neðan
> sótrauðr hani
> at sölum Heljar.

Hel is, more precisely, 'death'.

The colour of the cock differs in the variants, but in at least one version of this ballad and of 'Sweet William's Ghost' (77), where it is heard again, it is red. In the manner of his summons Sweet William's Ghost is like his Scandinavian counterpart Helgi who, in the second lay, is called from Sigrún as William is from Margaret: 'I must be west of the bridge of Windhelm ere the cock on Valholl awakes the warrior host.'[1]

In such a world not Odin but fate is supreme, for he too awaits the onset of death in the shape of the wolf, Fenris, which will swallow him up. In the ballads this fatalism shows itself in two ways: in the actual use of lots to decide what course to follow, and in the acceptance of the catastrophe as inevitable. In the *Hymis Kviða* there is a reference to what Vigfusson and Powell[2] call the 'divining rods' and the practice is frequent elsewhere in Old Norse literature where chips are used. The word used in the same context in the ballad is *cavil*, 'lot', which is usually identified, according to *O.E.D.*, with ON. *kafli* 'piece cut off', *kefli* 'bit, cylinder'. It is these twigs which decide in 'Brown Robyn' (57) 'wha the unhappy man may be' who causes the unbroken darkness; in 'Gil Brenton' (5a) which of the seven sisters 'suld to the grene-wood gang'. Whatever the result of casting the 'cavils' they are obeyed. The victims of their choice, like Bonnie Annie or Brown Robyn, are sacrificed; all, like the youngest of the seven sisters, recognize that their 'weird' is the hardest but suffer it nevertheless:

> The cavil it did on me fa,
> Which was the cause of a' my wa,
> For to the grenewood I must gae
> To pu' the nut but and the slae.

The acceptance of an inevitable fate runs right through the ballads even when the 'cavils' have no part in the story. It creates that fatalistic attitude towards catastrophe which is often regarded as mere detachment on the part of the ballad maker. But it is detachment born of fatalism which makes every ballad character realize that he must suffer his 'weird'. Sir Patrick Spens (58a) shows a prompt and full realization that the voyage commanded by the king will bring him death:

> O wha is this has don this deid
> This ill-deid don to me?—

[1] B. S. Phillpotts, *Edda and Saga* (London, 1931), p. 84. Völsungakviða hin forna 55: F. Jónsson, op. cit., p. 266:

> . . . skalk fyr vestan
> vindhjalms brúar,
> áðr Salgófnir
> sigþjóð veki.

vindhjalms is, more precisely, 'sky'.

[2] Vigfusson and Powell, op. cit., i. 220.

but his next word, in spite of the inauspicious omens, is a command:

> Mak haste, mak haste, my merry men all,
> Our guid ship sails the morne.

Hence the lack of comment and the starkness with which catastrophe is described in the ballads. The violent facts are merely stated:

> She had nae turned her throw the dance,
> Throw the dance but thrice,
> Whan she fell doun at Willie's feet,
> And up did never rise. (64)

for they are the fulfilment of a prescribed pattern.

We are back, then, in a specifically Germanic world where, as in the *Volsunga Saga*, a sister's son is a particularly close kinsman. So it is because Lord Wayet's sister's son has been into her bed that Lady Maisry does not wish to marry Lord Ingram (66c), and it is the realization of the closeness of the relationship which adds potency to the speech of the last of Johnie Cock's assailants:

> Then up bespake his sister's son,
> o' the next I'll gar him die. (114a)

Similar references occur in versions of all the following ballads: 'Lord Thomas and Fair Annet' (73h), 'Child Maurice' (83d), 'Prince Robert' (87c), 'Jellon Graeme' (90a), 'Robin Hood Newly Revived' (128), 'The Hunting of the Cheviot' (162), 'Johnie Armstrong' (169c), 'Lads of Wamphray' (184), 'Jock O' the Side' (187a), 'Lang Johnny More' (251), 'Lord Thomas and Lady Margaret' (260), and 'Child Owlet' (291).

In such a society the family is the focal point, and thus in the ballads as in the sagas the source of the most effective tragedy is a struggle between brother and brother, son and father, brother and sister. It is the strength of the blood relationship contrasting with the violence of the deed which gives force to Edward's murder of his father (13), the fratricide of 'The Twa Sisters' (10), 'The Twa Brothers' (49), the suicide of 'Lizie Wan' (51), and to the murder of the child in 'The Cruel Mother' (20). It is for this reason that such motivation as occurs in the ballad is very simple. When it is present it is as straightforward as the reason which causes May Margaret's brother to kill Clerk Saunders in her bed:

> We hae but ae sister,
> And see there her lying wi' a knight. (69a)

or that which causes the elder of the 'Twa Sisters' to kill the younger:

> Your cherry cheeks an yallow hair
> Gars me gang maiden for evermair. (10b)

Often, however, motivation is completely lacking: we are not told why Edward's mother incited him to kill his father, why Lord Randal (12) was killed by his sweetheart, nor why the children are transformed into a 'laily' worm and a 'machrel' of the sea. The catastrophe, as we have seen above, is destined and the ballad maker's concern is not to explain. The force of the ballad comes from the fear and hatred made manifest by the incident.

But although this force is due in part to the fact that the field of reference is the web of family relationships, the strife is not exclusively fratricidal. The most usual form it takes is that of the woman who follows her lover in preference to her family and finds herself involved first in enmity, then in the deaths of one or the other. This is what happens in 'Earl Brand', 'Clerk Saunders', and, with some variation, in 'The Cruel Brother' (11), and 'Lizie Wan' (51). In most ballads the lover–mistress relationship is the cause of death. The first form of conflict described above is a pattern familiar from Germanic literature: Freawaru, in *Beowulf*, finds herself in the same position when she marries Ingeld, lord of the enemies of her people; so does Signý who, in the *Völsunga Saga*, marries the Siggeir who kills her father and brothers.

But, added to this, in the world of the ballad, as described above, men like the heroes of *Beowulf* are fixed in time. This realization of a life inexorably delimited by fate is the heritage of the Germanic heroic tradition. The effect in the ballad, however, is quite different from that of *Beowulf*. Because man is doomed, and because in this world there is no real thought of an eternal after-life, the absolute good is seen as the union either of blood relations or of lover and mistress. The latter, in particular, is a characteristic feature of the ballad, and is exalted to a supremacy which it does not consistently hold in the sagas. In both the *Laxdale Saga* and the *Völsung Lay*, Guðrún and Brynhild cause the death of the men they love for the sake of their own honour. But in the ballad the lover is consistently preferred before the blood relations: in 'Earl Brand' the lady follows him after he has killed her father and seven brothers, Maisry (70) receives Willy to her bed after he has killed all her brothers to reach her, and 'The Fair Flower of Northumberland' (9) robs and leaves her father to follow his prisoner.

And just as the greatest good in this world, as in that of Malory's last books, is the union of lover and mistress, or of mother and sons, so separation and loss is the ultimate tragic event which cannot be alleviated. There is no after-life for ballad characters, and nothing more valuable than the happiness of earthly union. It is here that the pagan quality of the ballad makes its effect. Death here is not the triumph of *Samson Agonistes*, or even of the *Battle of Maldon*, or the anguished question-mark of Elizabethan tragedy. It is the irrevocable extinction of all that matters. So the ballad

stresses the physical corruption of death as the medieval 'danse macabre' did, but without giving it the significance of the latter. The body of the lover is seen in 'The Suffolk Miracle' (272) 'turning into mould', it is the prey of 'hongerey worms' (77a), 'wee worms' are its 'bedfellows' (47a), and when it leaves the grave as a ghost 'the channerin worm doth chide' (79a). Invariably the mouth of the returning ghost is 'full cold', as Sweet William tells Margaret (77b). The ghost in the 'Unquiet Grave' (78a) says that its lips are clay cold, and in 'The Twa Brothers' that they are bitter. When Lady Margaret asks Clerk Saunders:

> O wherein is your bonnie arms
> That wont to embrace me? (77f)

he answers: 'By worms they're eaten, in mools they're rotten.' So when a ghost does return it is as a joyless and restless creature fixed for ever in the wretched death it died. As Wimberley[1] has pointed out, the ghosts are never supernatural beings, but merely 'living' dead men. And since nothing is more tragic than separation in the ballad world, the return of the dead lover has a definite imaginative effect. It emphasizes the completeness of the negation which death represents by allowing the couple to be momentarily reunited, only to mock their hopes. This apparent second chance proves false, and serves to make the separation even more final.

Death, then, is corruption and negation. It has thus a poignancy which could only be achieved in a world like that of the Germanic heroic age in which even the gods were doomed. The closest parallel between heroic literature and the ballad in this respect is found in the second lay of Helgi Hundingsbana and 'The Unquiet Grave'. Although the Norse lay is infinitely superior, it tells the same story as the ballad. It is a fuller and more dignified treatment of the common theme. But in both it is the tears of the bereaved that waken the lover from the dead. As the ghost in 'The Unquiet Grave' (78) asks, after her lover has wept for a year and a day:

> Oh, who sits weeping on my grave
> And will not let me sleep?

So Helgi, roused from the dead, is asked by Sigrún, 'How may I win ease for thee my prince?'[2] and tells her:

> It is thy doing, thine only, Sigrun of Sevafell, that Helgi is drenched with dew. Thou weepest bitter tears, thou gold-decked, sun-bright lady of the South, before

[1] Op. cit., p. 229.

[2] Völsungakviða hin forna, 48. F. Jónsson, op. cit., p. 264:

> hvé skalk þér budlungr
> þess bót of vinna.

All quotations are from this text and the translation is that of B. S. Phillpotts, op. cit., pp. 83–84.

thou sleepest: every one of them drips on my breast like blood, cold as ice, piercing, heavy with woe.[1]

The unnamed lover of the ballad craves 'one kiss of your clay cold lips' where Sigrún tells Helgi: 'I would fain sleep in your arms my prince, as I would if thou wert quick yet.' The words of May Margaret to Clerk Saunders in the same situation are even closer to the Norse:

> Is there any room at your head Saunders?
> Is there any room at your feet?
> Or any room at your twa sides
> Where fain, fain, would I sleep. (77b)

Then in both lay and ballad comes the inevitable parting. 'The Unquiet Grave', though fragmentary, is enough to show that the lovers must leave each other again, and in 'Sweet William's Ghost', a ballad on the same theme, the ghost departs saying:

> O Cocks are crowing a merry middlarf,
> A wat the wilde foule boded day.
> The salms of Heaven will be sung
> And ere now I'll be misst away. (77b)

The reference to Heaven, with its implication that it is a less desirable place, is nullified by the tone of the rest of the ballad, and the passage echoes Helgi's words to Sigrún about his return:

But it is time for me to ride the reddening ways, to urge my pale steed in the paths of air: I must be west of the bridge of Windhelm ere the cock on Valholl awakes the warrior host.[2]

So the greatest of the ballads are linked with a pagan world like that symbolized by the second lay of Helgi Hundingsbana. This is important for the true appreciation of the ballads as imaginative compositions. Both their characteristic qualities of starkness and inevitability, and their tragic force, result from the fact that theirs is not the Christian God but Odin.

[1] Ein veldr þú Sigrún
frá Sevafjöllum,
es Helgi es
hrædögg sleginn.
Grætr gollvarid
grimmum tárum
sólbjört, suðrœn,
áðr sofa gangir,
hvert fellr blóðugt
á brjóst grami,
úrsvalt, innfjalgt,
ekka þrungit. (49–50)

[2] Mál's mér at rida
roðnar brautir,
láta fölvan jó
flugstig troða,
skalk fyr vestan
vindhjalms brúar,
áðr Salgófnir
sigþjóð veki. (55)

JOHNSON'S LAST ALLUSION TO MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

By MARY LASCELLES

JOHNSON'S last allusion to Mary Queen of Scots confronts us with a problem: how to explain an odd blunder which it contains—an error as to a passage of Scottish history that he knew particularly well, and an episode in that passage not easy to forget.

Johnson's interest in the reign of Mary Stuart can be traced back at least as far as 1760, when he epitomized, sympathetically, William Tytler's vindication of the Queen and denunciation of the Casket Letters as forgery, for the *Gentleman's Magazine*.[1] It should, moreover, be acknowledged that he was (for a man captious about historical writing) well read in the Scottish historians. That fascinating, though often misleading, document, the sale catalogue of his library, testifies to his possession of a number of their works; some were given him after his visit, and some he borrowed while he was composing the *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*. Many passed through his hands, especially in his latter years.

Now, among those histories which relate the Queen's reign, and which could have been known to Johnson, all that give any circumstantial account of her flight to England agree on a point which must indeed have been common knowledge: that, after the final defeat at Langside, she sought refuge in the Abbey of Dundrennan and, resolving to enter England, took ship at Kirkcudbright and landed at Workington on the Cumberland coast. Moreover, the episode is memorable for its pathos: that image of the Queen, with a remnant of her followers, going on board a fishing-boat to cross the Solway Firth is not easily effaced from the imagination. Nevertheless, this is how Johnson alludes to the episode, in a letter of 8 July 1784:

> When Queen Mary took the resolution of sheltering herself in England, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's attempting to dissuade her, attended on her journey and when they came to the irremeable stream that separated the two kingdoms, walked by her side into the water, in the middle of which he seized her bridle, and with earnestness proportioned to her danger and his own affection, pressed her to return. The Queen went forward.[2]

[1] W. W. Tytler, *An Inquiry, Historical and Critical, into the Evidence against Mary Queen of Scots* (Edinburgh, 1760). Johnson's *Account of a Book, entitled* (&c.): *Works* (1825), vi. 80–89.

[2] *The Letters of Samuel Johnson*, ed. R. W. Chapman (Oxford, 1952), iii. 178. (Letter 972, here as in G. Birkbeck Hill's edition.)

He was writing to Mrs. Thrale, whom he believed married or irrevocably committed to marriage with Piozzi, in an attempt to persuade her to settle in her own country, not her husband's. He was pleading urgently, but with small hope of success; and, with characteristic unselfconsciousness, likened her to the forlorn Queen and himself to her last true counsellor. Evidently, his mind sought an image of desolation and of a desperate endeavour to avert greater evil. But why did memory change the fishing-boat making out into the Solway Firth for the rider fording a stream? If the general tenor of the passage left any room for doubt, we might ascertain what was in his mind's eye from his choice of epithet: 'irremeable'—which Dryden had used to translate Virgil's 'irremeabilis'[1]—applied to the river that allows of no return, and which he had quoted from Dryden, to illustrate his *Dictionary*.

The explanation of this vagary of memory and imagination seems to lie in a train of events more intricate than has been hitherto recognized, and the disclosure may throw light on Johnson's mind—and also on an obscure passage in the growth of historical fiction.

George Birkbeck Hill,[2] remarking the historical error in Johnson's allusion, turned to the notable Scottish historians—Robertson, Hume, Keith, Anderson—in whose work it could not of course be found, and presently discovered 'J.'s story, or one like it' (as Dr. Chapman observes) in *Adami Blacvodæi Opera* (1644), p. 589. Blackwood, however, knew the course of Mary's flight, and though, as Hill notes, he or his printer was badly at fault in the spelling of place-names, there is nothing in his narrative to account for Johnson's error.

What I believe to have occurred may be most conveniently set out thus:

(i) As the wife of the Dauphin, with Poitou for her dowry, Mary Stuart befriended the young Adam Blackwood, a student in Paris, of ancient Scottish family but small resources; she obtained for him an appointment with her Parliament of Poitiers.[3] He repaid her bounty with lifelong devotion, writing in her cause (besides a Latin reply to Buchanan's *De Jure Regni*) a vindication in French of her life and conduct: *Martyre de la Royne d'Escosse Douariere de France*. This, which was published in 1587, probably in Paris but with a spurious Edinburgh imprint, was to be several times reissued and reprinted, and appear again, at the end of Blackwood's Latin works, in Paris in 1644.[4] In the *Martyre* he tells, as Birkbeck Hill noticed,

[1] *Aen.* vi. 425. See Dr. Chapman's note.

[2] *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1892), ii. 408–9.

[3] See the prefatory note to the 1644 *Opera*, and George Mackenzie's *Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation* (Edinburgh, 1708; 1711; 1722), iii. 487–8. See also (warily) *D.N.B.*

[4] See John Scott, *Bibliography of Works relating to Mary Queen of Scots 1544–1700* (Edinburgh, 1896), Nos. 144, 174, 175, 180, 237.

the story of an attempt by the Archbishop of St. Andrews (John Hamilton) to dissuade the Queen fron seeking refuge in England. Three particulars are worth remarking: the Archbishop is represented as old, experienced, and venerable;[1] he makes a long speech, alleging examples of English treachery, and, argument failing, tries to stay her fatal course by gesture:

> Quoy voyant ce venerable Prelat, & qu'elle se precipitoit en peril tout evidēt & certain, comme elle se mettoit sur l'eau pour descēdre en ceste terre fatalle se mit à genoux, la saisit au corps avec les deux bras, & avec larmes luy dit qu'elle auroit la peine de le trainer si elle passoit plus outre.[2]

Nevertheless,

> La Royne partant de Dundreuen descēdit a Vvirkinton, premiere ville des frōtieres d'Angleterre. . . .[3]

Clearly, Blackwood knew it to be a sea-passage, but there were sources of possible misunderstanding in his account of it: the places, thus disguised, would not be easily discoverable by a foreigner.

(ii) In his later years, the Jesuit Nicolas Caussin augmented a work of which he had published the first version in 1624: *La Cour Sainte*. The fifth part, added in 1645, consists of exemplary lives,[4] Mary Stuart's among them.[5] This is wholly unhistorical, and the sole point worth remarking is that, in the episode of the flight to England, whereas the story follows the outline of Blackwood's *Martyre*, the narrator would appear to be perplexed by the Queen's *taking ship*. He makes her embark originally with the intention of seeking refuge in France; hesitate, bend her thoughts towards England, resist the entreaties of the Archbishop, and eventually take the fatal decision.[6]

Thus a Frenchman, writing after 1645 and drawing on these two French versions of the story, might well set a query against the sea voyage.

(iii) In Paris in 1674, appeared a remarkable precursor of the historical novel as it was to develop more than a century later: *Marie Stuart Reyne*

[1] Hill comments on the far from venerable character of John Hamilton. This may explain why Walter Scott chose to transfer his gesture of remonstrance to another figure, in *The Abbot*: the right man would have evoked the wrong response, in Scottish readers.

[2] *Martyre* (1587), p. 182.

[3] Ibid., p. 183. The spelling of place-names varies from one edition to another of the *Martyre*.

[4] *La Cour Sainte Tome V, selon l'ordre ancien, contenant les vies et éloges des personnes illustres qui ont esté ajoustées et inserées dans l'ordre nouveau de la dernière édition* (Paris, 1645).

[5] This life appeared also independently, in Italian as well as French. See Scott, *Bibliography*, and Catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

[6] *La Cour Sainte* (Paris, 1645), seconde partie, tome ii, p. 1089. See also *The Holy Court* (London, 1678, i.e. the 4th edn. of the English translation, by Sir T[homas] H[awkins]), p. 817.

d'Escosse, Nouvelle Historique, by 'le Sieur de G.B.'; that is, Pierre le Pesant, Sieur de Boisguillebert.[1] A prefatory leaf, presumably the author's, explains the character amd intention of the work:

> Ce n'est point icy un Roman, c'est une Histoire tres-veritable; non-seulement dans le general, comme chacun sçait; mais encore dans toutes ses circonstances que beaucoup de gens ignorent, puisqu'elles sont également éloignées des deux idées de Martyre & de Courtisane, que le zele du Pere Caussin & les calomnies de Bucanan ont répandu jusques icy de cette Reyne dans le monde.

'Cette Histoire', we are assured, has been drawn from fifteen or sixteen authors, and indeed it presently becomes clear that the writer has looked into a number of histories and memoirs, and has been at pains to gather particulars.[2] Blackwood is among the sources, named and recognizable, and I suggest that it was a Frenchman's reading of his narrative, probably clouded by the doubt implicit in that of Caussin, which yielded this version of the flight to England:

> Ainsi tous les efforts de l'Archevesque de Saint André qui la vouloit détourner de ce dessein, furent inutils; il eust beau apres mille raisons alleguées en vain, se jetter jusques dans l'eau pour arrester son cheval par la bride, lors qu'elle passoit un ruisseau qui separe les deux Royaumes; il falust qu'elle se precipitât elle mesme dans sa ruine.[3]

The unaccountable embarkation appears to have been omitted. True, de Boisguillebert presently gives the place-names 'Dundrenen', Vvirkinton', 'Cokirmont', and 'Carlei',[4] as in Blackwood's narrative, but he betrays no disquiet at this discrepancy.

(iv) In 1725 two versions of this *nouvelle historique* were published in this country:

(*a*) *The Life of Mary Stewart, Queen of Scotland and France. Written Originally in French, and Now done into English. With Notes illustrating and confirming the most material Passages of this History, collected from Contemporary, and other Authors of the Greatest Character and Reputation.*

This was launched by the translator and editor, James Freebairn, in Edinburgh, with a list of Scottish subscribers.

(*b*) *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotts: being the Secret History of her Life, and the Real Causes of all Her Misfortunes. Containing a Relation of many particular Transactions in her Reign; never yet Published in any Collection. Translated from the French, By Mrs. Eliza Haywood.*

[1] Scott, *Bibliography*, No. 265. See also Freebairn's preface to his translation, epitomized below.

[2] For example, the circumstances of the Queen's arrival in Scotland; see p. 36, note 1 below. I have used the second edition (1675). [3] ii. 110. [4] ii. 117.

I am satisfied that (*b*) is not derived from (*a*),[1] and suppose it to be indeed translated, after a sluttish fashion, from the original French.

Both translators reproduce their author's claim to be considered as an historian, but Freebairn alone performs his task in this spirit. In a preface of his own he gives the name and some account of the French author;[2] discusses the reasons that may have prompted him to give an historical work the title of novel, and defends his veracity.[3] His text, moreover, is heavily documented with footnote quotations from Scots historians. He gives the Archbishop's speech at length—not direct from Blackwood, but from Mackenzie's life of the Queen, avowedly drawn from Blackwood's *Martyre*.[4] Another note, attached to the passage in which de Boisguillebert mentions Dundrennan, Workington, Cockermouth, and Carlisle, indicates the scope of his translator's own knowledge of the circumstances of the Queen's journey:

> The Queen landed at Workintone in Cumberland upon the 17th of May, 1568. having taken Boat at Kirkudbright . . . Crawfurd's *Memoirs* P. 81.[5]

With such sources of information available, Freebairn can hardly have overlooked (as Eliza Haywood most probably did) the discrepancy between the two passages in which the journey to England is mentioned; yet he allows it to pass without comment.

In de Boisguillebert, Freebairn, and Haywood, we have three authors, all of whose versions of this story were available when Johnson was a boy, and in any of which he might have found the crossing of the 'irremeable stream'. In default of further evidence, I should suppose Freebairn the likeliest. The English versions would be more accessible than the French;[6] and, of these two, Eliza Haywood's seems the less likely to have remained in any reader's mind among historical associations, for she reduces *nouvelle historique* to tawdry romance. Freebairn's solidity of documentation might well associate his work, remembered at some distance of time, with authentic history. That the discrepancy between history and fiction, present in all three, is made more patent in his by this very documentation need be no

[1] For example, Freebairn corrects the place-names, but Eliza Haywood retains the French spelling. Moreover, describing the night after her arrival in Scotland, de Boisguillebert says that the Queen was kept awake by 'tambours de Basque' (i. 30). Freebairn, omitting the unaccountable proper name, has merely 'Tabors' (p. 21). Haywood has 'Biscayan Drums' (p. 11).

[2] He is here called 'Pierre le Pesant Sieur du Bois, Guilbert', author of *Le Détail de la France*. See p. x.

[3] See pp. xi–xxxvi.

[4] Freebairn, p. 159. Mackenzie, op. cit., iii. 307–8. Mackenzie acknowledges his indebtedness in his life of Blackwood: ibid., iii. 511.

[5] p. 163.

[6] He may, of course, have met it among the French romances said to have been read by his wife in her sickness; but there is no end to surmise.

impediment: there can surely be no doubt of Johnson's *knowing* how Mary Stuart came to England.

The interest of this little train of events lies, however, not in the particular book that Johnson read; given but the certainty that there was such a book, it lies in his way of remembering it. Memory can be a sly servant: what has once taken possession of the imagination may still haunt it, notwithstanding the dictates of reason. Johnson, when he wrote this letter, was old, sick, and unhappy. Shaken by an event that had diminished the sources of his own happiness, and appeared to him to threaten that of the woman to whom his was largely due, he sought to express wretchedness and foreboding. Memory presented him with an image, none the less poignant for being (as he knew, at the rational level of consciousness) fictitious. Any pause—a mere fortuitous delay—might have given reason the opportunity to challenge the power of imagination over memory, and efface its tell-tale imprint in this letter. Remaining, it allows us to discern the impetuosity with which he wrote, and the measure of his unhappiness.

NOTE

SMOLLETT'S *THE TEARS OF SCOTLAND*

A HITHERTO UNNOTICED PRINTING AND SOME COMMENTS ON THE TEXT

THERE is an interesting early appearance of *The Tears of Scotland* in 1750, in a minor periodical, the *Mitre and Crown*,[1] which reprints it from the *Craftsman*. In the manner of the day the *Mitre and Crown* gives lengthy extracts from other papers, chiefly *Old England*, the *Remembrancer*, the *Westminster Journal*, and the *Craftsman*. In July 1750 (vol. ii, pp. 459–61) a long extract from the *Craftsman* consists of two poems, with the following introductory comment:

> *Craftsman*, June 26, 1750.[2]
> *To* CALEB D'ANVERS, *Esq*;
>
> SIR,
>
> NOTHING, I am sure, will be more agreeable to your Readers than the following Poems; the first is called *the Tears of Scotland*, and the other may be as properly stiled, *the Tears of England*. I have no Apology to make, that they contain less of the *L'Allegro* than the *Il Penseroso*; the Distress of my Country will only admit of the latter. If they have been published before, I have lost the Pleasure of knowing it; and perhaps I have several Fellow-Sufferers; but, in short, I may say of them, which has been said of something else, that they must be acceptable to whoever has, or has not read them. To conclude, the Poem on *Scotland* is, I am told, written by the Author of a celebrated Work of Humour, and that on *England* by *the great Bishop of* Rochester.
>
> I am,
> *Yours*, &c.

Smollett's poem is followed by one of about eighty lines in heroic couplets, a funeral tribute to Queen Anne, which begins:

> From joyous Songs, and from the vocal Groves,
> Which *Camus* cherishes, or *Isis* loves:
> Ye sacred Sisters, whose harmonious Sound
> Diffus'd the gladsome Notes of Peace around.

[1] 'The Mitre and Crown; or, Great Britain's true Interest. In which Our Constitution in Church and State will be explain'd and defended. . . . By a Gentleman late of the Temple.' Vol. i, n.d.; vol. ii, 1750 (Oct. 1748 to Jan. 1751).

[2] This is obviously a misprint for June 16.

Too soon by cruel Fate you're call'd away,
To cease your Triumphs for that happy Day.

This poem may be found in a collection of 1716, *The Loyal Mourner*, where it has the title, 'On the much lamented Death of the Most Pious and Illustrious Princess Her late Majesty Queen Anne who died, August 1, 1714'.[1] The two poems were presented in the *Craftsman* no doubt because of their political flavour; they might be regarded as 'Jacobite' poems. I have found no evidence to support the claim that the second is by Bishop Atterbury; the writer in the *Craftsman* may have attributed it to him merely to arouse interest. In the absence of other evidence it seems likely that he found the poem in *The Loyal Mourner*.

Little is known about the *Craftsman* after 1744, but the paper continued (in name at least) throughout the forties and early fifties, though there was apparently some confusion in numbering. The British Museum has No. 1111 (10 Oct. 1747) and No. 1159 (15 Sept. 1750); the Bodleian has No. 1124 (20 Jan. 1750). The dated extracts in the *Mitre and Crown*, from October 1748 to December 1750, confirm that the *Craftsman* was published weekly during that period, and provide some information about its contents. It is not known who was the editor in 1750; Arthur Murphy was writing in the paper by 1752 but presumably not earlier.[2] Whoever was responsible for the extract under discussion (whether the editor or a genuine contributor) must have known who was the author of *The Tears of Scotland*, and almost gives away the secret. 'Author of a celebrated Work of Humour' plainly indicates Smollett. This is interesting, because though his authorship must have been known to his friends all the early printings of the poem are anonymous. The earliest with Smollett's name seems to have been in the third edition of *The Union*, 1766. As late as 1767 the poem was printed anonymously in *A Collection of the most Esteemed Pieces of Poetry*. Yet it had been singled out for special mention three years earlier in the first biographical notice of Smollett, which appeared in the *Companion to the*

[1] Pp. 54–58. The full title of the volume is: *The Loyal Mourner for the Best of Princes Being a Collection of Poems Sacred to the Immortal Memory of her Late Majesty Queen Anne By a Society of Gentlemen. Published by Mr. Oldisworth.* The volume contains eighteen poems, mostly by named authors including Bishop Smalridge, Nahum Tate, and Edward Young.

[2] In the British Museum copy of *Gray's Inn Journal. By Charles Ranger esq*; n.d. (1754) there is the following manuscript note by Isaac Reed: 'This volume contains the last 52 numbers of the Gray's Inn Journal by A. Murphy, all that were printed in this size. The preceding numbers were published in the Craftsman.' The essays are dated from 29 Sept. 1753 to 21 Sept. 1754. The 1756 edition of *Gray's Inn Journal*, 2 vols., presumably includes the *Craftsman* essays; the earliest is dated 21 Oct. 1752. See also B.M. Add. MS. 35398, Thomas Birch to Philip Yorke, 6 Oct. 1753: 'The inclos'd is the Second Paper of Cha. Ranger, alias Murphy (his real name) since he discarded the Craftsman, and set up for himself.'

Playhouse, 1764: 'The Doctor had a very agreeable Vein of Poetry; as appeared by some little occasional Pieces, particularly the Tears of Scotland.'[1]

The text of the poem in the *Mitre and Crown* is a bad one. It is impossible to determine whether or not it is faithfully copied from the *Craftsman* since, as we have seen, no copy of the latter is known to survive for the date in question. Four lines are omitted altogether and to conceal this the poem is printed throughout in four-line stanzas. The omission was presumably deliberate, the lines in question (beginning 'Yet when the Rage of Battle ceas'd,') being among the most outspoken in the poem. The editor implies that he is printing both poems from manuscript ('If they have been published before, I have lost the pleasure of knowing it') but this is no doubt mere pretence. In any case his text is of no real interest because, apart from misprints, it is substantially the same as that in *The Land of Cakes* (n.d., see below) and in *The Thrush*, 1749, a collection of songs (without music).

An examination of the textual variants in the several early printings of *The Tears of Scotland* suggests strongly that the generally accepted text is corrupt. The earliest surviving text appears to be that in an undated leaflet of which two copies only are known, one in the Bodleian and one at Harvard. The poem is carefully printed and it is possible that Smollett may have ordered a small edition for private circulation. There is no indication of printer or publisher. The earliest dated text is in *The Thrush*, 1749 (Song 388). However, this follows closely an earlier printing in *The Land of Cakes, Book the first; Containing Six Songs, Set to Musick in the true Scots Taste. to which is added, The Tears of Scotland. London. Printed for R. Williams and sold at the Pamphlet & Musick Shops in Town and Country. Price 1s.* The only copy I have traced is in the National Library of Scotland. The date is probably December 1746.[2] The poem is printed in full with Oswald's music and this must be the edition which Smollett mentions in a letter written some time in 1747 to 'Jupiter' Carlyle:

[1] John Wilkes, who had been a close friend of Smollett, in *North Briton*, No. 6 (10 July 1762), makes mocking reference to the popularity of the poem in certain quarters. He writes ironically as a Scot, in reply to Smollett's *Briton*: 'How pathetic have been *our* lamentations! How has *our* admired elegy of *Mourn, hapless Caledonia! mourn*, echoed from hill to hill! With what tearful eyes is it still sung by every true *Scot*! In what moving strains did our bards celebrate their dear country's *sons lying slaughtered on the ground*, on that fatal day! fatal I mean to such numbers of my friends and countrymen.' Wilkes does not mention Smollett by name. It is not clear whether or not he expects many of his readers to know that Smollett was author of the poem.

[2] National Library of Scotland, Glen Collection 361 (2). For the date see the advertisement from the *General Advertizer*, 3 Dec. 1746, quoted by Lewis M. Knapp in *Tobias Smollett* (Princeton, 1939), p. 61. Knapp was apparently unaware of the existence of a copy of *The Land of Cakes*.

'A Ballad set to Musick under the name of the Tears of Scotland a Performance very well received at London.'[1] There are two significant departures from the leaflet text: in l. 43, 'round her Head', for 'o'er her Head', and in l. 53, 'And Spite of ', for 'In Spite of'. Smollett may himself have been responsible for these alterations.[2]

In 1753 the poem was printed in Thomas Warton's anthology *The Union*, in a text which differs from either of the above, though it incorporates the new readings in *The Land of Cakes*. The following is a list of the significant variants:

	Leaflet	*Union*
ll. 2 and 56	thy Laurel torn!	thy laurels torn!
l. 14	Where late they fed	Where once they fed
l. 16	Thine Infants perish	Thy infants perish
l. 17	What boots it, that, in ev'ry Clime,	What boots it then, in every clime,
l. 33	O baleful Cause!	Oh baneful cause,
l. 43	o'er her Head,	round her head;
l. 47	beneath inclement skies	beneath th' inclement skies,
l. 49	While the warm Blood	Whilst the warm blood
l. 53	In Spite of	And, spite of

Warton's text may be called the standard version. It is found in Goldsmith's *Beauties of English Poetry*, 1767 (with Smollett's name); in the first collection of Smollett's poems (*Plays and Poems*, 1777); and everywhere subsequently. Goldsmith no doubt took his text from Warton, the editor of *Plays and Poems* from Warton or Goldsmith; it is unlikely that each had independent access to some other source. Warton may thus be held responsible for the accepted text. How then are we to account for the new readings in *The Union*?

The difficulty is that we do not know where Warton found *The Tears of Scotland* and it is thus impossible to say whether the new readings originate with him or derive from his source. It is tempting to regard him as having been guilty of editorial revision (or carelessness) but in fact he seems to have followed closely his printed sources of recent poems, though freely altering punctuation and capitalization. The four poems in *The Union* taken from the *Museum* (1746–7), for example, were transcribed with reasonable faithfulness. He may have copied *The Tears of Scotland* from some printed source which has not yet come to light. The important point is that the text of the poem in *The Union* is manifestly inferior to that in the leaflet or

[1] 'New Smollett Letters', *T.L.S.*, 24 July 1943, p. 360.

[2] It is, of course, possible that the leaflet is later than *The Land of Cakes*, but I think this unlikely.

The Land of Cakes. This is most obvious in the third stanza, where the substitution of 'then' for 'that' makes the construction of the first four lines somewhat awkward.[1] A change of this kind might easily result from careless transcription or printing; it could hardly be the result of deliberate revision. The other variants matter less, but 'once' and 'baneful' are both weaker readings than the words they replace. Smollett was in the habit of revising his poems[2] and one must not assume that an author's revisions will always be for the better. None the less one is justified in claiming that he cannot be responsible for the text of *The Tears of Scotland* as it stands in *The Union*, and it is unfortunate that this text was perpetuated by eighteenth-century editors.

WILLIAM SCOTT

[1] What boots it then, in every clime,
Thro' the wide spreading waste of time,
Thy martial glory, crown'd with praise,
Still shone with undiminish'd blaze?

[2] See, for example, the progressive improvements of the last lines of *Love Elegy* from *Roderick Random*, ch. lxi, in the 3rd edn., 1750, and 5th edn., 1760.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

Sir,

In my review of John Buxton's *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (*R.E.S.*, N.S., vii (1956), 73) I remarked that the attribution of the drawing reproduced as Illustration No. 12 to Mathys van den Bergh was rather puzzling as it appeared in the catalogue of the exhibition of works by Nicholas Hilliard and Isaac Oliver held at the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1947 as 'the preliminary drawing' for a miniature by Isaac Oliver (also exhibited). Mr. Buxton informs me that the drawing has since been identified as a typical example of van den Bergh's copies of existing works. This does of course make the drawing less close to the sitter than if it had been Isaac Oliver's preliminary sketch for his miniature; but this is immaterial in the absence of any further evidence that the sitter was in fact the Countess of Bedford.

Mr. Buxton further explains that he chose the French engraving of Sidney used as the frontispiece to his book because it illustrates the pun on Sidney-Cygne, quotes Sidney's favourite motto, and implies something of his reputation on the Continent.

J. R.

REVIEWS

An Old English Grammar. By RANDOLPH QUIRK and C. L. WRENN. Pp. x+166. London: Methuen, 1955. 9*s.* 6*d.* net.

This Grammar is designed for students of Old English whose interests are mainly literary. On the grounds that most literary texts have come down to us in a Late West Saxon form 'Classical Old English' is taken as the norm, and is treated descriptively rather than historically. In addition to the usual sections on Inflexions, Word-Formation, and Phonology there is a short Introduction, treating mainly of Orthography and Pronunciation, and a section on Syntax. The features to which the authors attach most importance are the relatively detailed treatment of Syntax, the descriptions of the phonetic processes involved in sound-changes, the notes designed to lead the student to further study, and the clarity of the typography.

Professor Wrenn has elsewhere (*Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1933, pp. 65 ff.) argued the case for standardizing OE. on the WS. literary *koiné* current *c.* 1000. Certainly the language of Ælfric, with his constant care for verbal accuracy and polished style, provides a dialect of unusual regularity and widespread literary use; but the practice of this Grammar in preferring this 'Classical OE.' does not suggest that much is to be gained by abandoning Early WS. as our norm, and difficulties are created.

In effect the preference for 'Classical OE.' amounts to little more than the consistent use of 'unstable *i*' for EWS. *ie*. This is easily enough adhered to in Inflexions, though it entails frequent citation of earlier forms in *ie*, but the amount of repetition is greatly increased in Phonology, and leads to clumsiness which can only be demonstrated clumsily. Thus, after a fullish account of 'unstable *i*' (§ 193) we get a discussion of palatal diphthongization (§ 204), based necessarily on EWS., with further reference to 'unstable *i*'. This is followed immediately by 'Notes on diphthongs' (§ 205), which, consistent with the authors' preference for 'unstable *i*', must precede the account of *i*-mutation, since mutation *ie* is no longer a diphthong in 'Classical OE.' (though *ie* from palatal diphthongization had to be treated earlier). Some mention of mutation *ie*, however, must be made among the diphthongs, and the account of *i*-mutation is therefore anticipated, in some detail with respect to dialectal variation. Eventually we get an account of *i*-mutation (§ 208); the diphthongs are carefully segregated and cited first in 'classical' form, followed by the earlier forms. We must now retrace our steps to 'Notes on diphthongs' for the dialectal variants. Is this helpful? The preference for 'unstable *i*' makes it difficult for the student to recognize 'stable *y*'. It obscures, for example, the relationship ***beald*** : ***byldan***, &c. (stated but not explained in § 162), especially as these examples occur in proximity to the type ***cyre*** : ***ceosan***. The authors have themselves been misled into including ***fyll***, 'death' : ***feallan*** in a discussion of the type ***cyre*** with *i*-mutation of the reduced grade vowel (§ 209). The student will certainly find difficulties when he turns to

the glossaries of standard readers, to more advanced grammars, and to dictionaries, all of which are based on EWS.

The inflexions are very clearly set out. Bold-face type, instead of being used for all forms indiscriminately, is employed to pick out those paradigms which the student is advised to learn first. Another innovation is the citation in full of the definite article with each of the general declensions. Simplification and compression inevitably bring their own problems. Too many miscellaneous types of different origins are, perhaps, crowded into the supporting paragraphs, and some of the declensions are unhelpfully renamed. The use of the term 'irregular declensions' should have been avoided if its validity has immediately to be challenged by the authors themselves. Simplification leads to inaccuracy when *standan* is said to 'lose' its *-n-* in the preterite forms (§ 82), and an occasional detail might be challenged. But the beginner will be especially grateful for the guidance offered him on approaching this section, and should quickly learn the essentials from it.

The introduction of a section on Syntax into the Grammar was long overdue, and is to be applauded. Though this section makes no claim to completeness, and one might disagree with it here and there, it provides the student with an explanation of most of the syntactical usages he is likely to encounter, especially as the examples are drawn from standard readers or well-known poems. The Syntax has the virtue, too, of avoiding too rigid a classification, which inevitably leads to dogmatism and falsification.

The attempt to treat Phonology in terms of modern linguistic science is praiseworthy, though on the limited scale attempted the value of some of it may be doubted. The account of phonemes and allophones, too brief to be of much help, is scarcely applied to OE. phonology. A Phonetic Introduction is wisely provided, though it too suffers a little from compression, and reference to it might have been made under the account of Pronunciation. The same criticism could be made of the accounts of the First Germanic Consonant Shift and of Gradation, which are too brief to be really clear or useful. Similarly, the account of 'breaking' is neither completely stated nor fully illustrated. To cite the evidence on which one's views are based, and to be in some doubt as to the conclusions to be drawn, as in the account of *i*-mutation, is valuable training for the student. Sufficient evidence, however, must be cited for the purpose. Thus, the authors deny compensatory lengthening after loss of *-h-* between liquid and vowel (§ 189, also § 27). Such a view could perhaps be sustained, but not on the evidence offered. To dismiss metrical evidence for lengthening as inconclusive, then cite it as evidence against lengthening, is scarcely admissible; and Professor Girvan has questioned both examples of *fēore* here cited (*Beowulf and the Seventh Century*, p. 16). Lack of evidence for **wol-* < *wāla-* in *Walton* surely proves nothing. Why expect lengthening in a position in which original long vowels are regularly shortened, as in *Fawler*, *Ninham*, and many others?

The notion of a 'literary' student of Old English, for whom the Grammar is particularly designed, is hard to define clearly. We are conscious of this in the section on Phonology, and it may also account for an occasional lack of balance between elementary exposition and more advanced detail. The latter is, however,

mainly confined to the Notes, which form one of the most interesting and useful features of the book, though the choice of references for further study is sometimes, perhaps unavoidably, arbitrary. This Grammar is an interesting experiment, and if the difficulties inherent in experiment have been dwelt upon it is not to deny that it has substantial merits. To those already mentioned must be added the fact that it is a very practical Grammar for beginners, and it is up to date. Special praise is due to the authors, publishers, and printers for the care that has been taken with the typography, here designed as an aid to learning. Few misprints have been noted—*EO* for *OE*, § 15, n.; ***bilateral*** for ***biliteral***, p. 16, l. 1; ***gesion*** with macron omitted, § 131; a misplaced comma, § 157, l. 7; ***onslought***, p. 113, l. 3.

JOHN BRAIDWOOD

Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen. By HELMUT GNEUSS. Pp. viii + 184. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1955. DM. 18.60.

This somewhat elaborate study of Anglo-Saxon vocabulary is devoted to the effects of the impact of Latin on OE. It does not include Latin words taken over and incorporated, which in any case are relatively few, narrowly confined, and after the Anglo-Saxon period further restricted owing to displacement of OE. borrowings by French equivalents. What we find here is a discussion of native words employed as translations or adaptations of Latin. The net is cast wide. It includes old words in new senses to meet new needs, and new formations, mainly compounds on the model of Latin prototypes. Among these borrowings the author distinguishes (p. 2) ***Übersetzungen***, ***Übertragungen***, ***Schöpfungen***, and with these ***Bedeutungen***, all based on the methods set forth by W. Betz in his investigation of the debt of OHG. to Latin. Some forty pages are given to a discussion of principles and the efforts of previous investigators, and include some acute criticisms and observations; but the main part is a special study of OE. renderings in the Anglo-Saxon Psalters, in particular the Vespasian Psalter, the oldest of all, and at the same time one of the most important of OE. texts, which is a sufficient justification for a closer consideration of that text in the sequel. In this part the occurrence and use of the words discussed are carefully traced so far as dictionaries give evidence.

What we have to keep in mind is the effect on life and thought of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, a world profoundly modified by new and in part alien ideas which transformed at different levels and in various degrees the whole attitude to life and conduct; further, that we are dealing with literary texts, the vocabulary of literature, and of religious literature at that. With few exceptions Anglo-Saxon literature is directly or indirectly occupied with religion. We are thus at a double disadvantage. We know nothing directly of pre-Christian vocabulary and we do not know how far terms common in literary use were in normal vernacular employment. Many were no doubt understood, but it may be questioned how far they were used by the unlettered, which in practice was everyone outside the clerical classes. It is important to remember that Christianity—the real conversion of England—was spread not by books but by preaching

in the mother tongue. In the north Oswald acted as interpreter for Aidan preaching in Irish (Bede iii. 3), and later Aidan and his successors preached in English, and with them we may include Aldhelm. The preacher had to make himself understood and the use of Latin words was out of the question. Among the Irish who came to Northumbria Christianity had rooted itself so deeply that in their renderings the Latin words in which they first got knowledge of the new cycle of ideas had sunk to the level of the unconscious, and to them, as to Oswald, who knew no Latin, the words in which it was expressed, borrowed or not, were just Irish words like any other. There was no more thought of translation from Latin but of finding an equivalent for the word in the preacher's mind. It is improper to regard *god* as a translation of *deus*. It is a substitute for it; and so also in words like *fæder*, *sunu*, *geleafa*, *ece*, *wuldor*, *heofon*, *hell*, *synn*, *wite*, *susl*, *sawol*. It is no less so in *deofol*, *engel*, *biscop*, *cirice*, or in *dryhten*, *hælend*, *hælu*, *dom*, *deman*, *word*, *writan*, *boc*. The semantic field may not coincide, but that is inevitable. Words may be broadened, deepened, transformed, specialized in the new environment. I am suggesting that such words were incorporated long before any known work of translation. In Cædmon's Hymn we find in the vocabulary of an unlettered herdsman *dryhten*, *ece*, *hefenrice*, *sceppend*, *wuldurfadur*, *ælda barnum* as part of the oldest English Christian vocabulary. Some words seem to derive ultimately from Greek, of which there was more than a smattering in seventh-century Ireland where many English went for study at a date earlier than the influence of Theodore of Tarsus. The author remarks (pp. 24, 25) that the normal word for the cross in England was *rod*, occasionally *treow* or *gealga*; but not *crux* or the like, and with *rod* we may compare the Greek σταυρός.

The OE. interlinear version in V.Ps. is a gloss, not a translation in the true sense. It is quite evident that the glossator was not giving close attention to the connected sense, whence some of the remarkable, if exceptional, errors in rendering; cf. 118.25 and especially 67.31 noted below. Moreover, it is book-OE. and in part translator's OE. It follows that in rendering a sacred text the glossator endeavours to get as close as possible to the original and takes pains with Latin prefixes in order to bring out as far as he may the precise meaning, to give it accurately and completely. It follows also that the question arises how many of the compositional forms employed are real words worthy of a place in our dictionaries. We have numerous words confined to V.Ps., others to the Psalters in general, and some not so restricted which are nevertheless rare even in religious writings. It seems to me that the author presses his claims too far. There is no suggestion that his book does not contribute much of value for the study of OE. vocabulary, but rather a warning against too extensive conclusions from a limited, special field. It is easy to produce examples of words there specialized in a Christian sense, many of them nevertheless confined to special contexts. I cite, for example, *horn* for *cornu*, *dernlicgan* for *fornicari*. In literary use *becn*, *forebecn*, *tacn* are characteristic examples of words commonest in a religious sense, but in normal employment their associations are different. We may add *gast*, *feond* so specialized only in part, and distinct from *heofon*, *hell* completely specialized. The author might have noted the need in such a rendering for abstracts to give a precise equivalent where the native words had acquired or were on the way towards a concrete sense

(whence the notable frequency of formations in *-nis* and *-ung*), and words invented for the special occasion, nonce-words such as *singendlic* for *cantabilis*. He might have given more thought to Anglo-Saxon social conditions in determining the choice of rendering, e.g. in *dryhten* and *cneht*. In his remarks on *usura* and cognates he stresses the difficulty in dealing with ideas alien to the Teutons and really untranslatable, but does he think the Anglo-Saxons knew nothing of debts and debtors?

It is impossible to deal in detail with the numerous problems which emerge in such a study, and I confine myself to one point, not unnoticed by the author, of some importance for the language of the gloss, the meaning of *ondettan*, *ondetnis*. He justly stresses the dependence on commentators like Cassiodorus (cf., for example, *getynge*, *ripung*) and points out that in the Psalter *confiteri* mostly means 'praise' or 'give thanks'. So it does in other Biblical passages: it rarely means 'confess (sins)'. But the question is whether for the glossator in the ninth century *ondettan*, *ondetnis* meant 'praise'. I doubt that they did so then or later. Alfred's rendering of *confessio* in Ps. 94. 2 is in complete agreement with that of the Paris Psalter, *þæt we andettan ure fyrene*. This and other instances cited by Dr. Gneuss render it probable that the sense 'praise, thank' had already yielded place, if indeed *ondettan* ever had it.

It is held by some scholars that the V.Ps. gloss goes back to the eighth century. In the form in which we have it linguistic evidence does not justify pushing it back to that time, and certainly not deep into the century. Even a brief discussion entails reference to the early glossaries. It is not enough to characterize them simply as Mercian; they share characteristics which are not general Anglian or even general Mercian. Corpus, for example, shares with V.Ps. the same treatment of vowels before *l*-groups, similar treatment in smoothing, and, still more important, the same fronting of *a* which is the prerequisite for back-mutation in that vowel, but not (except isolated) the raising of *æ* to *e* which is peculiar to V.Ps. and Kentish. The language in Cp. and V.Ps. is thus closely related but not identical. Now Cp. is in part a copy of Epinal, more correctly of its original, Sweet's EE., and Ep. has borrowed from the original of our Leiden glossary. Cp. is commonly dated in the eighth century, by some palaeographers, e.g. Hessels, at the very beginning, but by Dr. E. A. Lowe 'VIII–IX'. If Cp. was written *c.* 700 we must date EE. some considerable distance farther back, well into the seventh century to allow time for the intervening linguistic changes, e.g. the back-mutation and the weakening of unstressed syllables. EE. had taken over material from the still earlier type of class glossaries represented by our Leiden, and its original must accordingly be dated some years earlier. It would be impossible to assign precise dates, but it is difficult to believe that this could have been much later than 650. The class glossary was made at some place where there was access to a fairly extensive theological library, and it is a plausible guess that the place of origin was Canterbury itself. At that time and for some time later no other place, not even Northumbria, has a claim to consideration. Nevertheless the language of these glossaries, though it has affinities with Kentish, is not Kentish. It can, however, hardly be anything but south-eastern. West and south-west are quite definitely excluded. On the other hand if we adopt a date

for Cp. later in the eighth century, and this seems to me on various grounds much more probable, it can yet hardly be much later than the middle of the century and the others assigned approximately to the beginning; and while that date does not so definitely exclude the west of England, it makes origin there at least improbable. It is a question of the date of religious foundations in the west. Northumbria, otherwise possible, is excluded on linguistic grounds. At all events V.Ps. is in a later form of a related dialect. In Cp. the back-mutation is extensively developed, but there is little confusion of *eo* and *io* which have not coalesced in one form as commonly they do in V.Ps., and Cp. has not the frequent delabialization of the second element, *ea* for *eo*. These changes also demand some time. Linguistic changes in different dialects need not synchronize, but when the dialects are closely akin, the conditions the same, and the result identical, the probability of territorial contiguity is great and the time-lag cannot be really considerable.

Let us consider one or two small points in V.Ps. in more detail. We find two forms with back-mutation—*fealan* and *ðweoran*, *-u*, which cannot be errors. The original stem-form of these was *felh-*, *ðwerh-*, and the vowel must have passed through the stages breaking, smoothing, lengthening with loss of *-h-*, and analogical shortening, before back-mutation; and in *fealan eo* has become *ea*. These and other later forms in V.Ps. demand some time and can hardly have been completed before the latter part of the eighth century. That back-mutation is not really old in either Anglian or WS. appears from the treatment of the new diphthongs. In the dialect of V.Ps., as also in WS., *eo* and *io* coalesced as *eo*. In V.Ps. coalescence seems to be complete in diphthongs due to breaking, and the spelling is regularly *eo*; not so in those due to back-mutation. Though *eo* is there the prevailing spelling for both, and invariable in *eo* from *e*, on the other hand when the vowel is *i* we find *io* beside *eo* in a large minority of cases, especially in the verb *niman* where *eo* appears only exceptionally. The retention of *io* (and *i*) in these circumstances can be explained only on the assumption that back-mutation was relatively recent. The evidence of WS. as in Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis* points to a similar conclusion and approximately the same date, and on the whole it is likely that back-mutation should be assigned to the ninth century or at all events to a date not earlier than the end of the eighth in its beginnings. But that conclusion excludes the possibility of V.Ps. being a direct copy of an eighth-century gloss. I hope to show that there is some evidence that it belongs to the early ninth.

Interlinear glosses are designed for those deficient in Latin, and this gloss does not originate in a period of notable Latin scholarship. In the Psalter itself traditional explanations and interpretations have preserved accuracy on the whole, but before dealing with errors, which mostly appear in the Canticles, I call attention to the use of two words which may have some significance for the date of the rendering. These are apparently mistranslations, but not in the usual sense. One is *concilium*. In 67.31 it is rendered accurately *gemot* but it appears twice as *geðæht*, which is the normal rendering of *consilium*. Of *geðæht* there are sixteen occurrences, in two of which (21.17 and 25.4) the Latin word is *concilium*. In two other cases the original meaning is clearly 'assembly' (88.8 and 110.1) but both are

written *consilium* and of course glossed *geðæht*. The use is similar to those in 21.17 and 25.4, and it is not impossible or unlikely that the glossator took them all in the same sense. The Latin words *concilium* and *consilium* (in certain senses) come very close and confusion is easy and occurs. Gneuss suggests (p. 119) that the latter had developed the sense *ratsversammlung* and that *geðæht* followed suit. That is needless, for *geðæht* means 'counsel, prudent counsel', also 'deliberation'; and the step from 'deliberation' to 'deliberative assembly' is easy and natural. In the passages cited above there is no doubt of the confusion and Toller's rendering 'deliberative assembly' seems perfectly just, nor is there need to doubt a native development. At the same time the words are carefully distinguished in contemporary documents of the eighth century, while in the early ninth we do find confusion, *concilium* for *consilium*, e.g. Birch, *Cart. Sax.* 312 (*anno* 803), *unanimo concilio totius sancti synodi*, also in an imitative document (Birch 290), rightly rendered *ræd* in an Anglo-Saxon version, *mid anmodan ræde ealles sinothes*. The confusion occurs elsewhere in the same century and may be coincidental; but the period is precisely that to which Sweet inclined to date the gloss to V.Ps.

There is another small point which seems to confirm the suggestion derivable from the above confusion, viz. the rendering of *opportunitas*. The word occurs twice in the dat. pl. at 9.10 and 9.22 *in op(p)ortunitatibus*, in the former glossed as *in gelimplicnissum*, in the latter *in gemalicnissum*, in each instance followed by *in tribulatione* glossed *in geswencednisse*, and the whole phrase means 'in difficult (or desperate) times', something like *in necessitatibus*; and the prose Psalter has respectively *æt ælcere ðearfe*, *to þære tide þe us nydþearf wæs*, perhaps a general paraphrase for the whole. It is possible that in 9.22 the glossator read *inopportunitatibus* (the Cambridge Psalter has in fact *ungedafenlicnes*) and that it was taken as *importunitas*, which is treated as and very likely is the opposite of *opportunitas*. But there is no need to assume an error in reading: that *opportunitas* had developed this sense is established by the fact that it is so employed in documents of the early ninth century. I cite Birch, *Cart. Sax.* 335 of the year 811, *cum tamen hoc universo populo opportunitas summa poposcerit et necessitas eximia hoc agendum cunctos undicunque coherceret*, and again Birch 380 of the year 834, *ad refectionem civorum quando alicui oportunitas vel necessitas temporis contigerit*. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there is a connexion between such use in Latin and the V.Ps. There may be others but I have not made a close study of this aspect.

Thanks to the living tradition there is little actual mistranslation in the Psalter itself. Gneuss notes *servituti* (twice) as *ðeowdome(s* where the meaning is 'use', and the curious *siðboren* for *postfaetantes* in 77.70 due to misplacement of *post*. We may add 118.25 *adhesit pavimento anima mea* rendered *ætfalh fyhto sawul min*, *fyhto* for *fyrhto* (cf. Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter), and more remarkable 67.31 *increpa feras silvarum concilium taurorum* rendered *ðu ðreades wuda gemot fearra* where the opening words were read as *increpaferas*. Mr. Sisam (*Studies in Old English Literature*, p. 4, n. 2) argued on the ground of a reading in the later Regius Psalter that our gloss was made for a different Latin text and copied from thence. It does not seem to me to follow, and *f* is not seldom written for *v* (*u*) in documents of the early ninth century.

In the Canticles, where the glossator has to depend on himself, the weakness in Latin scholarship is evident. Leaving aside errors due to misreading of the text, 1.3, 3.15, 7.25, 8.9, or to mistaking the Latin case, 4.16, 6.16, we have 4.10 *ðeowincelu* for *familici* (properly *famelici*) as if from *famulus*, 4.16 *sundurseld* for *solium* by association with *solus* or *solum*. Eadwine's Psalter has a similar error, and the prose *Guthlac* has been equally misled in rendering *eremus* 'hermitage' by the same word. Other errors are due to plain ignorance, 6.24 *in comminatione* as *in neoweste* (apparently he connected it with *comminus*; *genehlaecu* for *conbinabor* Psalm 140.4 is not on a par), 7.49 *trahentium* as *telendra* (as if *detrahentium*), 11.3 *perpeti* as *ðrowian* (he knew the word as the infinitive of *perpetior* but not as the ablative of *perpes*), 11.13 *crepusculum* as *degred* when it means 'evening twilight' and so 'darkness', 12.12 *somnient* as *slepað* when as usual it means 'dream'. In 11.13 Sweet's text has *in labere* glossed *in wege*, which is to me incomprehensible. Gneuss may well be right when he says the text really has *inlabere* and *inwege*. Even so *inwegan* (if it exists) is not a satisfactory rendering of *illabi* and *inwege* is not an imperative. Did the glossator possibly misread *in libra* and translate *in wēge*? It is sufficiently clear that we are in a period of weak scholarship, that knowledge of Latin is quite uncertain and we are well on the way to the complete decrepitude of a later date.

Signs of decay appear in contemporary documents from the last quarter of the eighth century and become more numerous and more striking at the beginning of the ninth. It is well to remember that charters are not strictly original compositions but copies or repetitions of familiar and stereotyped formulas. The writers can hardly go astray in the tenor and the errors are in fact in inflexional endings, in government and the like. Only when for some reason there is departure from the normal form, is there opportunity for and occurrence of more serious blunders. In a document of about the year 800 (Birch 201) we read *in expeditionis necessitatem vires v tantum modo mittantur* (*vires* for *viri*); later, *c.* 860 (Birch 515), in an accurate copy of the twelfth century *hos omnes consenserunt*, and the error can be paralleled early. In another dated 839 (Birch 426), but apparently written about 880, we find complete breakdown sufficient to justify Alfred's familiar statement. I think his words were meant to apply to the parish priests, but the condition of Latin even in the archbishop's chancery can be judged from a charter of the year 824 (Birch 381). A little later in 838 (Birch 421) a very important agreement of Egbert and Æthelwulf with the Archbishop of Canterbury is scarcely intelligible. It is preserved in the original, in the counterpart, and in a contemporary copy and Sir Frank Stenton in *Anglo-Saxon England* (p. 232, n. 2) characterizes it roundly as illiterate.

I have stressed the condition of scholarship because the evidence suggests a close connexion of V.Ps. with the early ninth century. The existing gloss may be a copy since palaeographers agree that the date of writing was very late ninth century. That is a matter I am not competent to discuss, but I do not find any satisfactory internal evidence of copying. The Psalter itself used to be dated *c.* 700, more recently as eighth century and by some scholars after the middle. That seems to be on account of miniatures, decoration, and the use of gold, and these do not seem to me equally demonstrative as compared with the script. The

newer views apply in particular to the so-called Canterbury School and hardly concern us here. Professor S. M. Kuhn made a valiant attempt to transfer the production to Lichfield, but a southern origin is hardly to be denied, though not necessarily Canterbury. Kuhn perhaps failed to recall that the most important Mercian town in England was London, that it was a favourite resort of Mercian kings from Æthelbald onwards, that many of their frequent *concilia* were held in the vicinity, and that it would be at least a very singular circumstance if no literary activity had its centre there. R. GIRVAN

The Peterborough Chronicle (The Bodleian Manuscript Laud Misc. 636). Edited by DOROTHY WHITELOCK with an Appendix by CECILY CLARK. Pp. 44+183 plates (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 4). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger; London: Allen & Unwin; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1954. £15. 15s. (to subscribers).

One only of the texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle has hitherto been printed in facsimile, namely, the Parker or A text, published in 1941 by the late Dr. Robin Flower and Professor A. H. Smith for the Early English Text Society. We now owe to the enterprise of the Danish publishers a photographic facsimile of the well-known Peterborough Chronicle (the E text), edited by Dr. Dorothy Whitelock. It is to be warmly welcomed. A number of palaeographical and textual points which have been under discussion can now be settled by reference to the facsimile. The manuscript is undoubtedly written in one hand at one stretch up to the end of annal 1121. Moreover, Wanley was right in his view that, although the appearance of the ink changes, the entries that follow from 1122 to 1131 inclusive were all nevertheless made by the first scribe. There is a change of hand at annal 1132, and this second scribe wrote the remainder of the text probably soon after the last events mentioned, which belong to the early part of 1155. Further, the common statement that the manuscript is 'mutilated' at the end is mistaken. As Miss Cecily Clark has observed, the final continuation (1132–55) ends precisely with f. 91 b 'just as if composed to fit'. She may well be right in her view, based on a recent examination of the quiring, that if parchment had been cheaper, or if the quiring of the manuscript had been different, then the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, represented in this Peterborough text, might not have ended so abruptly, in spite of the forces then militating against the composition of history in English prose.[1]

The important Introduction follows the general lines laid down for this series as a whole. For example, the handwriting is minutely described, and new light is thrown by an analysis of the marginalia on the use of the manuscript in the sixteenth century. A considerable amount of valuable new material, some of it modifying existing views or proposing alternatives, is presented. This bears witness to Dr. Whitelock's extensive knowledge of Anglo-Saxon historical sources, and is characterized by the exact scholarship and acute criticism typical of her work. The development of the Peterborough Chronicle is examined

[1] In 'Notes on MS. Laud Misc. 636', *M.Æ.*, xxiii (1954), 72.

in detail, and its probable sources and relationships with other texts (including the Latin chronicle compiled at Peterborough by Hugo Candidus, a contemporary of the scribes who wrote our manuscript) are investigated. And further, a detailed study is contributed by Miss Clark, in an appendix, of the manuscript relations of the various versions of the brief Anglo-Norman 'Brut' Chronicle (extending from Brutus to Edward I) which in the late thirteenth century was copied on the margins of ff. 86 b to 90 b of the Peterborough text.

The Peterborough Chronicle is an important historical source and also offers the most substantial piece of writing from the early post-Conquest period. It is well known for its brilliant portrait, by an eye-witness, of King William the Conqueror, for its account of the Domesday Survey, for its description of the misery inflicted on the fenlands by great magnates such as Geoffrey de Mandeville during the Anarchy. In the extension from 1122 to 1155 it illustrates the changing linguistic tendencies of the age in which it originated, and reflects the intellectual and moral conditions of the twelfth century. Its account of the alleged murder by Jews 'in King Stephen's time' of St. William of Norwich is a new departure in English hagiography—the first appearance in English of the myth of murder by the Jews to which more than one boy saint owes his saintship; of these the best-known, through Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale*, is St. Hugh of Lincoln. The story of the appearance of the 'Wild Hunt' in the neighbouring woods, shortly after the arrival at Peterborough of the hated abbot, Henry of St. Jean d'Angély, is a piece of folk-lore also utilized by Walter Map (Dist. i, Cap. xi), and, in a different tone, by the poet of *Sir Orfeo* (ll. 281–8). This story is in fact so widely distributed that some 215 variants are recorded in Professor Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (vol. ii (1933), 388 ff.). Again, certain grants in favour of Peterborough Abbey inserted into the chronicle by the twelfth-century copyist might be taken as representative of the forged charters with which twelfth-century monastic houses sometimes provided themselves when faced with the necessity of producing written evidence for their right to the possession of lands and privileges.

It is now generally accepted that about the year 1121 a manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was borrowed at Peterborough, most probably from St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in consequence of the fire in 1116. An obstacle to the acceptance of Plummer's suggestion[1] that the person through whom the manuscript was borrowed may very possibly have been Bishop Ernulf of Rochester, who is credited with the compilation of the important *Textus Roffensis*, and who had been abbot of Peterborough 1107–14, and before that prior of Canterbury, is the hostility known to have existed between St. Augustine's on the one hand, and the archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the cathedral priory, on the other. The same objection would probably apply to Ernulf's successor at Peterborough, during whose rule the manuscript was borrowed, Abbot John of Séez (1114–25), a protegé of the archbishop of Canterbury, Ralph of Séez. And, moreover, there were undoubtedly links between Peterborough and St. Augustine's unknown to us, and constant coming-and-going

[1] *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II. liv, n. 4.

between religious houses. The outspokenness of the references to Abbot Henry of St. Jean d'Angély in annals 1127–32 (written contemporaneously by an author who, except in 1132, does not know the outcome of events as he describes them) suggests that at this period the compilation of the chronicle was carried on independently of the head of the house, as does also the continuance of the entries during the two years' vacancy which preceded Abbot Henry's appointment. The foreign element was probably small among the sixty monks who in 1125 made up the community; Professor Knowles has observed[1] that the fenland circle of monasteries, to which Peterborough belonged, was one of two groups that retained after the Conquest a community of predominantly English blood.

Dr. Whitelock's Introduction adds much to our knowledge of the character and sources of the Peterborough text. Not only is the identity between themselves of the handwriting of annals 1122–31 inclusive accepted, but Mr. N. R. Ker's subdivision of these annals into six blocks of writing, entered by one hand at different times, and in different ink, is also reported. These are: 1122; 1123; 1124; 1125–6 *lande*; 1126 *On pes ilces geares* –1127; 1128–31. This group of annals, together with those following, from 1132 to the conclusion in 1155, all of which were composed for the Chronicle and not merely copied into it, 'allow an estimate to be formed of twelfth-century English in part of the Danelaw'. But the annals after 1121 are not to be regarded as a purely local production, not known outside this house. The appearance in (the so-called) Florence of Worcester (as in annal 1130) of some of the material entered in E suggests that the Peterborough chronicler had an existing source for the parts of general (not solely domestic) interest in the annals 1122–31. Similarly, although the annals from 1079 on, when D ends, have come down to us only in the Peterborough text, the Waverley Annals include an accurate Latin translation of much of the Peterborough material, and this translation (for reasons given by the editor) could not have been made from the Peterborough manuscript itself.

After re-examining the evidence, and balancing probabilities, Dr. Whitelock is led to question common assumptions as to the relationship of the Peterborough Chronicle to the D text, and to put forward an alternative view, which has much to recommend it, and which, moreover, involves a different attitude from that of Plummer towards the 'northern recension', the common ancestor of D and E. Whereas in all the earlier portions, D and E go back to a common original (which differs from the A, B, and C texts in having inserted a great deal of material of northern interest), there are also important differences between D and E. It is often assumed, remarks Dr. Whitelock, that this means that the northern recension divided early into two versions, of which one, the ancestor of D, received certain continuations (of which she gives details), while the other, the ancestor of E, did not. She now suggests that the present condition of D is more probably to be ascribed to its being a copy of a conflation of the northern recension with a manuscript of the C-type, at a later date, after the agreement with E has come to an end. If this assumption is correct, then E, she remarks, is the better representative of the northern recension. As to the place of composition of D, the editor argues for York rather than Worcester (or Evesham), as affording

[1] *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1940), p. 424.

a much better explanation of the considerable Scandinavian element in D, and as fitting in well with the reference in annal 1052 to 'this northern province (*norðende*)'. She considers that the great interest shown in Queen Margaret of Scotland proves that this portion of the D text (which ends in 1079, except for one later, garbled, entry, and of which the earliest hand is not of earlier date than the second half of the eleventh century), was not composed until after her marriage with King Malcolm in 1070. The development of the northern recension itself is also associated by Dr. Whitelock with York (rather than Ripon, suggested by Plummer). 'York has general probability in its favour, for it was the one church for which there is evidence for continuity throughout the Danish invasion and settlement.' More specific references here would have been helpful to specialists, but the case outlined for York is in fact impressive, and some of the most telling points are based on facts hitherto disregarded or unexplained. For example, King Edgar's ravaging of Thanet (969 E) can be understood from information given by Roger of Wendover, 'who used reliable York material', as a punitive measure undertaken because the men of Thanet had ill-treated some York merchants.

Reference to the photograph under ultraviolet rays of the last page of the manuscript, badly rubbed and in parts only faintly legible, makes it necessary to correct in two or three points the transcript of the concluding seven lines given on pp. 13–14 of the Introduction. For l. 26, *was bletsæd* (where *pær* has dropped out) read *wæs pær bletsæd*. Plummer read *was*, but *wæs* is clear under ultraviolet rays, and for the form *wæs* we may compare f. 91 a, l. 25, *scæ wæs*. For l. 29, *Rameseie* read *Ramesæie* (as Plummer); the *æ* is clear in the ultraviolet photograph but looks like *e* in the ordinary one. The form in l. 29 beginning with *E* or *F* remains a crux, and Dr. Whitelock's suggestion that what the scribe wrote was not a place-name but possibly *For ham* or *For panon*, 'went home' or 'went thence', is worth considering. On p. 31, col. 1, l. 25, the date 1179 should be corrected to 1079. It is nowhere stated, so far as I have observed, that the Annals of Rouen, mentioned several times, are printed in F. Liebermann's *Ungedruckte anglo-normannische Geschichtsquellen*, a work included on p. 37 among Works Mentioned in the Introduction, but not in fact mentioned there under that title.

F. E. HARMER

Studien zu John Gower. By MARIA WICKERT. Pp. 204. Köln: Universitäts-Verlag, 1953. No price given.

That the first monograph devoted to Gower should concentrate attention on his least-read work—the *Vox Clamantis*—seems odd today. Yet there is a certain rightness about it: the Latin poem is the most passionate, as it was at first the most popular, of his three major works: this is the poem that we must read if we would understand what Chaucer meant by addressing his friend as 'moral'; the *Confessio* being merely an experimental diversion in the vernacular.

Moral the *Vox Clamantis* certainly is. But it is also very long—and in Latin verse of a kind that very few of us now read for pleasure. Yet in some ways Gower's Latin is easier to construe than his deceptively simple English; and the

hexameters of Clough's *Bothie*, or his *Amours De Voyage*—besides showing certain odd, if accidental, affinities in style—will sufficiently attune us to Gower's smooth elegiacs. As to his morality, it differs from that nowadays expounded by such preachers as the Dean of St. Paul's (cf., for example, *The Listener* for 16 Dec. 1954) chiefly in being more forcefully urged. This clerical comparison is not made at random, any more than was Gower's choice of a title: for him as for his readers the *vox clamantis* was a preacher's and a prophet's voice, crying like John the Baptist in the wilderness 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord'. His poem is both an *increpatio* and a *comminatio de presenti et futuro*. And the chief value of Miss Wickert's studies springs from her recognition of the homiletic origins of Gower's style and matter. Professor Owst long ago hinted at this; but it has been left to Miss Wickert to demonstrate, by quotations ranging from Bonaventure and Bromyard to Waldeby and Thomas Walleys, the close relation of this work to traditional exegesis, contemporary sermons, and *artes predicandi*. Like the exordium of Langland's Fifth Passus, it is a kind of *sermo ad status*; and, like Langland's bishop, Gower treats of contemporary events. His political theory is of a piece with his morality. For him moral regeneration must precede social and political reform.

From the time that Fuller cited, in his *Church History*, the allusion to Wat Tyler it has been generally known that Gower wrote parts of this poem with an eye on events in the reign of Richard II and in particular the 'Peasants' Revolt'. Indeed, critics have hitherto read the poem with an eye on nothing else, whereas Gower meant his references to these events merely to drive his moral home. They stirred his deep, disinterested patriotism—ll. 17–26 of Book II and 1289 ff. of Book VII are as moving in their fashion as the dying Gaunt's words on 'this other Eden, demi-paradise', and not unlike them; but if Miss Wickert's thesis is correct he had written part of his first recension as a *Fürstenspiegel* for the young Richard before the Revolt occurred. Her intricate arguments on the date of the work, resting in part on differences between the prose summaries, have daunted me for many months, and even now I may not be summarizing them correctly. She regards Book I as an independent *Visio* loosely added to the rest of the poem, the title of which first occurs in the Prologue to Book II. This original *Vox* exists in two redactions, which differ, *inter alia*, in their comments on the young king (Book VI, c. vii), the B redaction being more pessimistic, more severe, and critical of his youthful associates—the *concio juvenilis*; it also mentions the Great Schism, a subject on which Gower felt so strongly that his silence in the A redaction must point to a date for that version prior to the autumn of 1378. In both versions his attitude to the labouring classes is for the most part markedly different from that of the *Visio*, where the rebellious peasant is Satan incarnate, and much closer to that of the *Miroir*, where the main criticism is of the failure of the higher classes of society to fulfil their obligations; both *Miroir* and the first draft of the *Vox*, therefore, were probably written shortly before 1381, when it was not too late to warn that

> His, nisi iusticia fuerit terrore parata,
> Succumbent domini tempore credo brevi. (v. 653–4)

On the other hand, the *Chronica Tripertita*, which begins at 1387, is in some sense a continuation of the *Vox*, and there are some indications that Gower was working on the text of the *Vox* and adjusting the prose commentaries as late as the last year of Richard's reign.

Even at his most didactic Gower remains a rhetorician and a court poet. If he preaches on Justice to the young king it is because writers of *Fürstenspiegeln*, from the *Secreta Secretorum* onwards, had regularly done so. Miss Wickert is probably right in regarding Books III–IV of the *Vox* as another Mirror for a Prince: that Gower knew the *Secreta* is clear from Book VII of the *Confessio*, to say nothing of evidence that Mr. Manzalaoui has lately assembled. If, following St. Bernard, he takes as his text *Nosce te ipsum*, he gives it a certain stoic colour, just as he discusses *Liberum Arbitrium* in Boethian rather than Augustinian terms; differing from Chaucer chiefly in his unequivocal denial (in the *Vox* as in the *Confessio*) that the stars above us govern our conditions. As a rhetorician he is careful to state, indeed to state twice, in the Prologue to Book II, the *causa materialis*, *efficiens*, *finalis*, *et formalis* of his work; and he uses in his *invocatio* no less than four conventional *topoi*. Yet in the next Prologue (III. 39–42) he comes close to the preacher's notion of *gratia sermonis* and *gratia auditus*; and Miss Wickert very properly illustrates the theme of ll. 93–100 ('Nec mihi laus meriti sit sine laude tua') by a passage from Higden on rectitude of intention, and the allusion to Balaam's ass (II. 45) by a passage from Guibert de Nogent on 2 Peter, ii. 16—a passage, incidentally, which explains how Gower as a layman could assume a preacher's role at a time when the ethical type of sermon was becoming dominant.

The sixth and last of Miss Wickert's chapters is a study of Gower's narrative technique as exemplified in three tales from the *Confessio Amantis*: those of Actæon, Pygmalion, and Florent. For many readers this will be the most appealing and most rewarding part of the book. Never indulging in extravagant praise, she succeeds in putting her finger on the poet's metrical and syntactical, as well as his psychological subtleties: noting, for instance, the delicate antithesis and chiasmus of Book IV, 1703–10—where Florent's plight is treated in medical terms ('he drinkth the bitre with the swete') for the same reason that it is elsewhere called a 'penance' and a 'purgatory'. Her comparisons with Ovid and with Chaucer bring out, perhaps better than has ever been done before, the real nature of his moral concerns. Thus she notes how Gower makes Actæon the centre of the action; avoiding Ovid's sensual effects not from prudishness but from preoccupation with Actæon's lack of restraint; just as in the story of Pygmalion he treats the statue as more than an occasion for eroticism: Pygmalion (whose restless yearning, Miss Wickert remarks, is deftly suggested by a whole relay of verbs: IV. 402–10) is always the courtly lover—'evere amonge he axeth grace'. Finally, whilst admitting that Florent is no more than a knightly type in the first part of his story, she points out that as soon as he is alone he becomes an individual with power of reflection and moral choice; and shows that this development not only betrays Gower's abiding psychological interests but gives a dimension to the tale that is necessarily missing from Chaucer's version, placed as it is in the mouth of the much-married wife of Bath.

J. A. W. BENNETT

Sir Orfeo. Edited by A. J. Bliss. Pp. lii + 80 (Oxford English Monographs). Oxford: University Press, 1954. 15*s.* net.

Mr. Sisam remarked once[1] that 'copyists . . . are as a rule careless rather than bold innovators. . . . Professional minstrels and amateur reciters played a great part in the transmission of popular literature; they . . . treated the exact form and words of their author with scant respect.' This he illustrated by citing ll. 267–8 of *Sir Orfeo* in the three versions which survive. He concluded: 'If the Ashmole MS. alone had survived we should have no hint of the degree of corruption.' With this new edition of *Sir Orfeo*, in which the three versions are printed in full for the first time, we can measure the degree of corruption which may take place in the transmission of medieval works. The best version, the Auchinleck, has already been printed in full by Sisam in his anthology; but there has been no separate edition for nearly seventy-five years. Professor Bliss has thus filled a gap, and he has done it excellently.

His Introduction takes up nearly half the book. It gives a full account of the manuscripts and of their dialects and affiliation. This enables him to state that 'the original dialect of *Sir Orfeo* conforms with the little that is known of the Westminster Middlesex dialect of the second half of the thirteenth century' (p. xxi). He then deals with the problem of the sources, in what is virtually a study of the 'Breton lay' in Middle English (perhaps the weakest part of the book). The beginning of Chaucer's *Prologue to the Franklin's Tale* should perhaps have been quoted (or at least referred to), since it gives a definition of the 'Breton lay' which agrees with the one given by the anonymous author of *Sir Orfeo*, and Mr. Bliss accepts Mrs. Loomis's view that the Auchinleck manuscript may have belonged to Chaucer (p. x). In the last part of the Introduction the literary qualities and the derivatives of *Sir Orfeo* are treated. The texts follow, with palaeographical notes, commentaries, two glossaries (one to the Auchinleck text, which 'in view of its linguistic interest . . . is exhaustive'; and a Supplementary Glossary, in which 'words which occur only in the two fifteenth-century versions are listed'), and an Index of Proper Names.

This edition is attractive, clearly devised, and well presented. The notes on the text are concise and to the point. Mr. Bliss knows what he talks about. Yet it is to be regretted that the presentation of the palaeographical notes is inconsistent. Some are printed as footnotes to the texts: some are relegated to the Notes, which are mainly interpretative. Moreover, they are at times too concise, as for instance the note on *sprede*, 67: 'the *r* is inserted above the line'. We should like to know whether the insertion is due to the scribe, or to a contemporary hand, or a later hand. It would have been better to print all such notes as footnotes to the texts, and to refer to them in the Notes when they require some literary or philological commentary and interpretation.

Mr. Bliss is responsible for the punctuation of the texts. In his own words he has 'adopted a more liberal and lively style of punctuation than is customary in editions of medieval texts'. Moreover, he has 'punctuated the three texts uniformly, except where a difference of construction or idiom demands a different

[1] *Fourteenth-Century Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1944), p. 266.

treatment, so as to facilitate comparison of the three versions' (p. v). But it is precisely then that it would be interesting to know the manuscript punctuation, the more so as the accuracy of Mr. Bliss's punctuation can sometimes be questioned. Thus Ashmole l. 384 reads: 'And som, *þer* body*s* had wou*n*de,' whereas Auchinleck has '& sum þurth þe bodi hadde wounde,' and Harley omits. As it stands the line (in the absence of any translation) seems to mean 'some, their bodies had wounds'—not very satisfactory. In discussing *Sir Gawain and the Carl of Carlisle* l. 209, *Some your lyvys ȝe schold forlete*, Miss Kurvinen[1] states that '*your* is probably to be regarded as a late instance of the old partitive genitive' and that 'the same construction occurs in *Sir Orfeo* 391 (MS. Ashmole 61, Zielke's edition, p. 106, note) "And some þer bodys" '.[2] According to this view the Ashmole line must be translated 'some of their bodies had wounds'. The passage from *The Carl of Carlisle* discussed by Miss Kurvinen and the *Orfeo* line are not parallel. In the former *some ȝe* may be in apposition;[3] but *som* in *Sir Orfeo* stands alone. A more closely similar phrase is actually recorded in Old English. It occurs in *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. Skeat, Homily XXIII B (St. Mary of Egypt), l. 793: *of þam* (i.e. the torn strip) *maria sumne hire lichaman bewæfde*, 'with which Mary had covered a part of her body'. If indeed *som þer bodys* is a survival of the Old English turn the line should be translated 'And some parts of their bodies had wounds', which makes sense. But the Ashmole text is very corrupt and has been so muddled (both by scribe and editors) that it is dangerous to build any serious theory on it. It is better to regard this line (and the next, which Mr. Bliss apparently accepts as genuine and on which he has a note) as a corrupt rendering of the Auchinleck version. But all the same a note was required and we miss it; just as we miss a note justifying Mr. Bliss's emendation of l. 388 (Auchinleck), on which Sisam has a note which Mr. Bliss should perhaps have quoted. This is the more to be regretted since the notes are in general excellent, and correct many erroneous interpretations or misreadings. A good example is *aumal* 364, for the usual editorial reading *animal*.[4] Mr. Bliss points out that only five minims appear in the manuscript between *a* and *a*. The sense required by the context seems to be 'enamel', ME. *aumail* < OFr. *amail*, *émail*. The existence may be noted, however, of OFr. *auma(i)lles* derived from L. *animalia* (Mod.Fr. *aumaille*, surviving in present-day dialects, e.g. Walloon *åmaye*); though this word does not appear in ME. And *animal*, which (as Mr. Bliss notes) is not elsewhere found in English until the end of the sixteenth century, and is rare in French until the same century, though recorded in the twelfth,[5] should not appear in *Sir Orfeo*.

[1] *Sir Gawain and the Carl of Carlisle in two Versions* (Helsinki, 1951), p. 176.

[2] Mr. Bliss reads *som*. But he states in his Note on Contractions (p. 1) that 'in both the later manuscripts a final curl has been ignored'. It is highly probable that Zielke, like many editors of his time, interpreted it as *-e*.

[3] See Professor Norman Davis's review of Miss Kurvinen's edition of *Sir Gawain and the Carl of Carlisle* in *M.Æ.*, xxii (1953), p. 40.

[4] [The reading *aumal* seems to have been published first by Professor C. L. Wrenn in 'The Value of Spelling as Evidence', *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1943, p. 33; but the manuscript had been so read by Miss S. I. Tucker in 1938.—Ed.]

[5] See O. Bloch et W. v. Wartburg, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française* (Paris, 1950), s.v.

There are a few minor errors in the etymologies suggested by Mr. Bliss. Is *e* in *schert* beside *kirtel* really 'due to lowering by the following *r*' (p. xxii)? If so, why should *kirtel* occur instead of *kertel* (as in *Ayenbite*), the more so as Mr. Bliss remarks (p. xxii, n. 3) that 'in other pieces written by this scribe *e* is not uncommon, particularly in the word *fer* "fire".' The explanation is probably this: OE. *y* could appear in the Auchinleck language (which in Mr. Bliss's words 'represents the beginnings of a standard literary dialect, predominantly Anglian in colouring. . . . It leads directly on to the language of Chaucer'), as both *i* and *e*, cf. the Kentish Glosses *gremetunc*/*grimetung*, glossing *fremitus* and *ru(g)itus* respectively.

Sometimes the macron is omitted as in *a* for *ā* (§ 28(5)), or added when not required as in AN. *forēst*, but these are minor mistakes and it would be mere pettifoggery to prolong their list. They do not lessen the value of this edition, which not only fulfils 'the main purpose of the author', namely 'to present a readable text of the three versions of the poem', but is certainly an improvement on the previous editions of this delightful lay. S. R. T. O. D'ARDENNE

Sir David Lindsay. Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits. Edited by JAMES KINSLEY, with a Critical Introduction by AGNES MURE MACKENZIE and a Foreword by IVOR BROWN. Pp. 236. London: Cassell, 1954. 21s. net.

This is the handsomest edition—indeed, apart from that contained in Laing's Lindsay, the only handsome one—that has yet appeared of the *Satire*. Well designed in every way, with distinguished print, paper, binding, and wrapper, it is not, even at a guinea, so very dear a book, as prices go today. But for whom is it intended?

Agnes Mure Mackenzie's introduction on the background and the play, possibly the last of her writings to have been published in her lifetime, has the qualities that one expects—enthusiasm, patriotic fervour, freedom from pedantry. It is aimed at the common reader rather than at the scholar. So is Mr. Ivor Brown's Foreword on the play at the Edinburgh Festival, recalling the excitement of that revival.

While the basis of the text on the 1602 quarto, with the citation of variant readings—but not the banns or other additional passages—from the Bannatyne manuscript, presents little difficulty after the vast labour of Mr. Hamer, Professor Kinsley's textual note and his *apparatus uere criticus* are of an admirable simplicity. It is, however, in his glossary that his industry and shrewdness and understanding of literature and usage really appear. (It is noticeable too that Sir William Craigie's *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* has begun to exercise the same sort of influence on editing as the *Oxford English Dictionary* has already done.) Words and phrases requiring annotation have been marked with an obelus in the text. The notes on them, incorporated in the glossary, contain apt illustrations and comparisons and justify this new edition better than anything else in it. But neither they nor the sixteenth-century text that they elucidate will appeal to the average playgoer, who is catered for by Mr. Robert

Kemp's acting version in eighteenth-century Scots and by his translation of that into English.

The more important part of Mr. Kinsley's volume is in fact designed for students, and students have seldom a guinea to spend on a single text. The publishers might argue that Dr. Mackenzie and Mr. Brown provide a live interest in a difficult play. That is true up to a point, but at present we are in danger of losing interest in the whole Scottish literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and nothing can preserve that interest except an inexpensive collection of scholarly editions. In the Scottish Text Society we have the counterpart of the 'Société des Anciens Textes', but we need also something cheaper and simpler and more selective, on the lines of the 'Classiques français du Moyen Âge'. At one stage it looked as though Messrs. Faber or the Saltire Society might fill the gap. Now yet another opportunity has been missed of inaugurating such a series, and the loss must be deplored, at the same time as thanks are offered to Mr. Kinsley for his editorial work. W. BEATTIE

***The Contention* and Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*.** By CHARLES TYLER PROUTY. Pp. x + 157. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1954. $4; 32*s*. net.

Professor Prouty claims to prove, by a more than usually objective analysis, that *2 Henry VI* is a revised version of *The Contention*. Since the inquiry is deliberately blinkered, confined to a comparison of the texts, tracking through problems of staging, style, structure, treatment of character, and choice of sources, it disarms appeal from outside evidence and asks to be judged by the quality of its attention to detail.

This being so, it is odd that the summing up puts strongest emphasis on that part of the argument which receives the most perfunctory treatment—'that the sources point inevitably to the fact that Q cannot have been derived from F'. We are told that a Mr. A. D. Richardson, in an unpublished Yale dissertation, proves Grafton the main source of Q and finds no evidence for the use of Holinshed. On the other hand, it is said, McKerrow and Dover Wilson have shown F to rely on Shakespeare's 'almost exclusive' historical source, the 1587 Holinshed. 'Are we to assume', it is asked, 'that by some incredible chance a reporter forgot every line or passage that was derived from Holinshed and thus produced a text whose only sources were those which Richardson has ascertained?' Mr. Richardson cannot yet be interrogated, but we may observe that the other witnesses appear to have been suborned; McKerrow argued, fantastically, that the first (1577) Holinshed was the basis of F,[1] while Dover Wilson, so far from thinking Holinshed an almost exclusive source, takes most of his illustrations from Grafton and Hall. Recognizing, however, that the 1587 Holinshed was used for the genealogy in F II. ii, for the Cade scenes, and for the Duchess's

[1] *R.E.S.*, IX (1933), 157–69.

penitence,[1] and ignoring the traces of Grafton and Hall at other points of the play, it would still require no 'incredible chance' for a reporter, in so drastically an abbreviated version as Q, to miss the handful of lines which act as touchstones.[2] But, as it happens, they are not all omitted. Among the lines apparently owed to a passage in Holinshed's account of the Peasants' Revolt is Cade's 'Hang him with Pen and Ink-horne about his necke'. The source passage is omitted from all copies of Grafton known to me, but a version of the F line is nevertheless caught up in Q, 'go hang him with his penny-inckhorne about his necke' (where 'penny', incidentally, looks like an auditory slip). Mr. Richardson may have observed this crux and disposed of it, but we cannot be satisfied with the present impulsive brevities.

One of the arguments relating to sources does, however, own a limited validity. If the York genealogy in Q is adapted from Grafton and that in F from Holinshed, Alexander's main evidence for memorial reconstruction is lightly undermined. Only lightly, for Mr. Prouty himself has to explain the muddled state of Q by alleging a compositor's misinterpretation of either 'marginal interlineations' or of 'a scrap of paper pasted over the original'. May we not assume that this 'original' was so garbled a version of the F genealogy that it had to be corrected from a convenient chronicle, which happened to be Grafton? If not, what else (to use Mr. Prouty's own lingo) are we to 'hypothecate' about that 'original'?

It has long been recognized that text and directions indicate some differences of staging between the two versions, but these do not in themselves argue derivation one way or the other. Mr. Prouty is surely mistaken in his assumption that an original text is always logically tidier than a derivation. Since the process of abbreviation forces little inconsistencies into relief, I think that most of the 'improvements' noticed in the second chapter are to be expected from a reporter or an adapter. One such occurs where F has Suffolk react only to the second speaking of the ominous name 'Walter'; it is not surprising that the severely cut Q irons out this inconsistency; but it would be odd if a reviser (especially one so bent on preserving his original) deliberately introduced it. Characteristically, however, Mr. Prouty makes much of this adjustment and lets pass the more significant variants in the scene. Q, for example, sets its words, 'Base Iadie groome', over twenty lines before the passage beginning, 'Hast not thou kist thy hand and held my stirrope?'; in F, 'iaded Groome' is explained directly and specifically. F describes Suffolk's mouth as 'yawning' because it has swallowed the treasure of the realm; Q keeps 'yawning' but does not explain it. F has a joke about Suffolk once having smiled at Gloucester's death, but now his skull, 'Against the senseless windes shall grin in vain'; Q appears to preserve the first part of the taunt and miss the second. Finally, Walter's boast in F, 'Therefore, when Merchant-like I sell reuenge, Broke be my sword', seems to be corrupted into Q's illogical 'I lost mine eye in boording of the ship, And

[1] Holinshed (1587) and Foxe are the only chroniclers who both mention the taper and misname Stanley 'Sir John'.

[2] The same applies to the omission of the name of Henry V from Q. Prouty (p. 83) thinks this indicates revision after the success of *Henry V*; but Tarlton acted in a Henry V play before 1588.

therefore I marchantlike sell blood for gold.' In each of these instances (and there are others) it seems necessary to refer to F to see how Q came to be written. The local corruptions in F are comparatively trifling.

The bluntness of the critical instruments is felt again in the chapter on style. Among his samples Mr. Prouty compares the two versions of Winchester's dying speech in order to remark Shakespeare's infusion into Q of poetry of 'a functional and dramatic quality'. Even his curious textual postulate of a prompt-book with many of the characteristics of very foul papers, however, does not explain how the Q lines ever came to masquerade as blank verse in an author's manuscript:

> Why died he not in his bed?
> What would you haue me to do then?
> Can I make men liue whether they will or no?

Nor is there an initial probability that the corresponding F lines, voicing an heroic outfacing of justice, were fashioned from the rhythmic crassness of Q:

> Bring me vnto my Triall when you will.
> Dy'de he not in his bed? Where should he dye?
> Can I make men liue where they will or no?

This touchstone does not, of course, prove the precedence of F; but as the speech proceeds the indications of that precedence are more firmly marked. In the next F line ('Oh torture me no more, I will confesse') Winchester sees Justice as an inquisitor and his bed as a rack, and his agony is motive for his calling for poison at the end of the speech; Q keeps the poison but misses the pain and the point. In the succeeding F lines Winchester thinks his victim lives again in the historical present, when money buys peace of conscience, but he realizes that this is the apocalyptic future and Gloucester is resurrected from the dead. Now it happens that the vision is dominated by Gloucester's eyes (blinded by the dust of the grave) and by his hair ('Combe downe his haire; looke, looke, it stands vpright'), and it is significant that Winchester is made to see the dead Gloucester as Warwick first pictured him in F:

> His eye balles further out, than when he liued,
> Staring full gastly, like a strangled man:
> His hayre vprear'd, his nostrils stretcht with strugling.

Q retains the eyes and the upstanding hair for Winchester's vision ('And stares me in the face. Looke, looke, coame downe his haire') but has nothing about them in the scene of Gloucester's death. The marks of strangulation could find no place anyway in Q, which, following another chronicle suggestion, has Gloucester smothered.

A failure to trace the web of detail invalidates most of the points about style and structure, but it might be thought that the case will still rest on the analogue proposed between these plays on the one hand, and the several states of the *Thomas More* manuscript and *The Spanish Tragedy* on the other. The *More* manuscript is supposed to show that meticulous stylistic rehandling, using almost every shred of the old text, was a recognized practice, and not the absurdity which Chambers thought it. The points are illustrated not from the allegedly

Shakespearian hand D, but from folios 12 and 13, mostly the work of hand C. Not much is known of hand C, but Mr. Prouty ought at least to have considered the possibility that these pages exemplify the inability of a practised playwright to amplify and revise a given text without at the same time paraphrasing and modifying it. Certainly neither the *More* manuscript nor the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* offer much support for this thesis; for where in these instances the revision is conservative it is ineffective, and where it is effective it is not conservative. Mr. Prouty would have us believe at once in Shakespeare's superb amplifications and in his habit of slavish fidelity to the banalities of his dramatic source. I prefer to attribute the inequalities of execution in the *Henry VI* plays to the poet's embarrassment in face of the brittle facts, rigid theories, and inept value-judgements of the English chroniclers, and as for the fitful staple verse of Q, I prefer to believe with Hart that an adapter abbreviating the play chose to cut the 'rigmarole'.

Mr. Prouty assures us in his conclusion that 'we must now reject the idea of Shakespeare, early in his career, writing popular original plays dealing with English history'. But fortunately for the integrity of received opinion, I think it possible to challenge the force of that peremptory 'must'. J. P. BROCKBANK

Shakespeare Survey 8. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. viii+172. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. 18*s*. net.

The present volume maintains the high standards established by its forerunners and, since it caters for so wide a range of interests, what a reviewer dwells on in its articles can, in the circumstances, express no more than a personal bias. Of outstanding interest is I. A. Shapiro's reading of the date at the end of Munday's *John a Kent* as 1590—not 1596, as hitherto supposed. This leads him to place the revision of *Sir Thomas More* *c.* 1593, during the temporary alliance of Strange's Men and the Admiral's, and to a reappraisal of the significance of Munday's work as a dramatist in the late 1580's. Of a somewhat similar character is John Briley's account (with transcripts) of two documents from the Sackville-Knole manuscripts, shedding light on Edward Alleyn's financial interests in the Bear Garden between 1615 and 1621.

The focal point of the present volume is the Comedies, and contributions under this head are prefaced by J. R. Brown's well-balanced survey of twentieth-century work in this field down to, and including, the so-called 'dark' comedies. From this it would seem that the interpretation of Shakespearian comedy is increasingly at sea—a matter for little wonder in view of the present stress on parable and allegory instead of artistic purposes. I found Nevill Coghill's article on *Measure for Measure*, agreeably written as it was, turned a very blind eye to the significance of Shakespeare's plotting—the more surprisingly since the unusual device of employing the Duke as commentator and manipulator of the plot enabled Shakespeare to keep the audience unusually well informed about its comic design. Isabella and the Friar-Duke by no means enforce a religious pattern on interpretation in my opinion. Isabella's position as a novice and the Duke's disguise as a Friar are simply a cunning device to explain how a young

girl could credibly be persuaded to connive at the bed-trick—the novice does not question the advice of her 'good father'. I have never seen the play acted, but, if I do, I hope it will be my good fortune to see it played as a skilfully contrived ironic comedy without allegorical overtones. Kenneth Muir's attempt to hold a critical balance in the interpretation of *Troilus and Cressida* was less provoking, though he underestimated, I think, the importance of Pandarus and Thersites as commentators; but among the essays in interpretation I give pride of place to Harold Jenkins's commentary on *As You Like It*, since his emphasis seemed to me where it should be—on Shakespeare's *methods*. The stress he rightly lays on Shakespeare's juxtapositions will explain, for instance, how Barnardine (too bad to be served up to Heaven) fits into the comic purpose of *Measure for Measure*. J. M. Nosworthy contributes an article on the Integrity of Shakespeare, illustrated from *Cymbeline*, by reference to sources and parallels; and the Comedies section closes with an original and stimulating article by Ludwig Borinski on Shakespeare's Comic Prose. Here again, the emphasis on method seemed to me the right way of arriving at an appreciation of Shakespeare's aims and achievement. The article is the most substantial contribution to Shakespeare studies in the volume and will give everyone much to think about.

Textual studies are represented by Dover Wilson's second instalment of 'The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts', showing what the new methods involve in the particularly complicated problem of *Romeo and Juliet*. Roy Walker's article on 'The Celestial Plane in Shakespeare' is the prelude to a fuller examination of a subject that naturally requires more analysis than the scope of an article allows. Sir Barry Jackson writes on Producing the Comedies, Ngaio Marsh on a production of *Twelfth Night* in the Antipodes, Richard David on Shakespeare productions during the winter of 1953–4, and Tyrone Guthrie on 'Shakespeare at Stratford, Ontario'. The account in the last of these of the implications of an 'open' stage for acting technique interested me greatly for its possible bearing on Shakespeare's technique as a writer. 'In practice two things emerge: the naturalness and expressiveness of the group is more important than the face of any single member of the group; a good actor's behind is often just as expressive as his face.' Does this, I wonder, mean that a comment such as 'see, he gnaws his lip' was intended to serve much the same kind of purpose as dialogue references to locality or the time of day or night?

Finally there are the customary International Notes, a list of Shakespeare Productions in the United Kingdom during 1953, and Reviews of the year's contribution to Shakespearian study by Clifford Leech, I. A. Shapiro, and James McManaway.

ALICE WALKER

Shakespeare's Use of Music. A Study of the Music and its Performance in the Original Productions of Seven Comedies. By JOHN H. LONG. Pp. xv + 213. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1955. $4.75.

The comedies studied in this volume are: *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*. The main merit of Mr. Long's

study is that he earnestly searches for suitable Elizabethan tunes for all the musical cues in these seven plays. An up-to-date consideration of the role of music in the plays of Shakespeare is long overdue. The Victorians may have been content with Arne, Schubert, and Mendelssohn; but the literary and musical scholarship of the last decades pleads for a more authentic approach, taking into account the wealth of newly discovered materials. Here the modern editions of the Fitzwilliam and Mulliner Books and Fellowes's monumental collection, *The English School of Lutenist Song Writers*, are invaluable, because they provide Elizabethan and Jacobean tunes to which Shakespeare's verse may be fitted, where no contemporary setting survives. Such general works as William Chappell's *Popular Music of the Olden Time* (1859) and J. M. Gibbon's *Melody and the Lyric* (1930), and the monographs of E. W. Naylor (*Shakespeare and Music*, 2nd edn., 1931) and Richmond Noble (*Shakespeare's Use of Song*, 1923) are still valuable, but obviously need to be brought up to date.

In his 'Study of the Music and its Performance in the Original Productions' Mr. Long has provided an example of music suitable for each stage direction that calls for a song or dance. The usefulness and originality of these thirty-five examples differ from case to case. The author has reprinted a number of the examples given in the older works of Chappell, Gibbon, and Naylor, such as the Playford 'What shall he have that killed the deer' from Gibbon, 'The Three Merry Men' from Naylor, and the traditional version (though 'there is no reason to believe it was used during Shakespeare's lifetime') of Chappell's 'When that I was a little tiny boy'. It is a great convenience to have these and other tunes within the covers of one book. For the stage director searching for a likely melody it is a further boon to have some of the lyrics fitted to tunes that appear in Chappell and others, where no authentic setting is as yet known. Mr. Long has found melodies in Chappell for 'The woosel cock, so black of hue' and 'Blow, blow thou winter wind'. To the latter he has added six measures of his own, since the given melody was not of sufficient length. Such musical tailoring is often necessary, as anyone who has produced a play knows, and Mr. Long's graftings are by and large welcome additions, though in the case of 'Blow, blow' the second half of the music has an awkward gait (p. 149).

The least satisfactory category of the examples given comprises songs for which the author suggests an old tune but fails to make clear which syllables and notes coincide. Nor does he state by what criteria he is led at times to fit Shakespeare's verse to a melody in Chappell (or to one of his own devising), whilst in numerous other instances the music plate merely offers a song for the sake of 'flavour' or 'similarity' without any efforts on Mr. Long's part to fit the words to the suggested tune. Furthermore, the text does not make clear whether the tune printed is the one actually to be used. We read (p. 58): 'The original music for "Who is Silvia?" has been lost, but the example in Plate II may suggest the flavor of the music used in the early productions of the play.' Plate II offers us the vocal part of Jones's 'She whose matchless beauty', reprinted from Fellowes; it is of no practical help that one can see. Likewise, in commenting upon 'Tell me where is Fancy bred' Mr. Long draws attention to similarities between it and Sidney's 'Who hath fancy pleased', reasoning (p. 111) that the close analogy between the

two lyrics suggests the possibility that Shakespeare 'realized the appropriateness of Sidney's song to the situation and decided to employ a similar song which would supply the music he wished'. The accompanying plate gives Sidney's words fitted to the tune 'Wilhelmus van Nassau', as printed in Gibbon. This is puzzling, since the number of accents per line differs in the two lyrics, and consequently the suggestion is of no help to the stage director who requires a singable tune with accents that coincide with Shakespeare's text.

The author's discussion of 'Tell me . . .' reveals a further weakness of the book in that a number of bibliographical references display a lack of scholarly judgement and method. Mr. Long believes that 'Tell me . . .' was accompanied on the lute. What, then, is one to make of the following footnote (p. 118) as a reference to substantiate this reasonable assumption?

> It will be remembered that David Rizzio, private secretary to Mary of Scotland, originally was retained by her as a lutenist. He was murdered in 1566. (S. Zweig, *Mary Queen of Scotland and the Isles*, pp. 112–14.)

And what of the note (p. 130), obviously taken from an unchecked nineteenth-century source, that Ms. Dd. ii. 11 of the Cambridge University Library is to be found in the 'Public Library, Cambridge, England'? Furthermore, there are important omissions in the bibliography, among which one may instance the article by Percy A. Scholes ('The Purpose behind Shakespeare's Use of Music', *Proceedings of The Royal Musical Association*, 1917) and that by Edward J. Dent ('Shakespeare and Music', *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (Cambridge, 1934)); also Walter Woodfill's book, *Musicians in English Society* (Princeton, 1953). Similarly, the annotated bibliography of fourteen pages does not inform us that Chappell's pioneer work, '*Popular Music of the Olden Time*, 2 vols., London: no date' was published between 1855 and 1859, and revised and bibliographically expanded by H. E. Wooldridge in 1893. Numerous items in the bibliography are labelled 'not seen'. This seems excusable in the case of rare books listed in the *S.T.C.* but not in the case of widely available reference works such as Charles Burney's *General History of Music* . . . and Percy Scholes's *The Puritans and Music*. These shortcomings could easily have been remedied by research in any large reference library. It would be unfair to demand of the author, who is associate professor of English at Morehead State College, Kentucky, a comprehensive knowledge of specialized musicological articles. However, his discourse would have profited greatly had he consulted the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*. John Ward's 'The "Dolfull Domps"' (vol. iv, 1951) would have been helpful in illuminating Shakespeare's 'deploring dumpe' (Long, p. 52); Gustave Reese's 'The Origin of the English *in Nomine*' (vol. ii, 1949) would have explained the meaning of this enigmatic term (Long, pp. 31, 43); and Otto Gombosi's 'Some Musical Aspects of the English Court Masque' (vol. i, 1948) would have made clear that the 'measure' in *Love's Labour's Lost* is not a galliard, as Mr. Long suggests (p. 70), but a pavane.

It must be said in fairness to the author that his topic is not only important: it is beset with extreme difficulties. Perhaps this is why no historian of literature or of music has produced a book on this topic since the second edition of Naylor's work was published in 1931.

FREDERICK W. STERNFELD

The Tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance Ethics in Action. By ENNIS REES. Pp. xii+223. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. $4.50; 36*s*. net.

This book gives a careful account of Chapman's half-dozen tragedies considered as the expression of a consistent ethical doctrine. Not primarily concerned with the provenance of Chapman's ideas, it does not seek to add to what we have learnt of his sources from the Continental scholars F. L. Schoell and J. Jacquot; and, notwithstanding its sub-title, it wisely refrains from making Chapman typify Renaissance thought in general. But its exposition of Chapman's own views, aided by well-chosen quotations, is more lucid and coherent than any I have hitherto met with. Beginning with the emphasis which Chapman placed on learning as the nourishment of the life of the mind, it shows how he extolled the man who could subdue his brutish nature, impose order upon his passions, and retire in the security of the inner life to the 'strength' of 'eternal things'. The tragedies themselves Mr. Rees accordingly sees as dramatizing the conflict between the inner and the outer life: in particular they oppose the man of virtue to the man of policy, whom Chapman condemns not simply for his Machiavellian unscrupulousness as to means but for his pursuit of worldly ends. This interpretation will be readily accepted, and is indeed not unfamiliar, for tragedies like *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* and *Caesar and Pompey*: its thoroughgoing application also to *Bussy d'Ambois* and the *Byron* plays is the most challenging thing in the book.

It will not, I hope, be incompatible with respect for Mr. Rees's analysis of Chapman's tragedies for me to raise one or two queries about his conclusions and the critical method by which they are arrived at. To begin with, he is very confident—and unless he is ignorant of modern critical controversies, a little rash—in dogmatizing about Chapman's 'intention'. Protesting, perhaps too much, about the misunderstandings of previous critics, can he himself be quite so certain how Chapman's tragedies 'were meant to be understood'? To be sure, he is not without evidence: it is one of his merits to use the whole corpus of Chapman's work, including not only the poems but the commentaries upon Homer, to amplify sentiments expressed in the tragedies. But was Chapman, one wonders, quite so consistent, so single-minded even, as this book makes him appear? It is a useful and much-sanctioned critical practice to construct from an author's total output his philosophy of life; but the result is after all an abstraction, and the practice will be a dangerous one if it leads us to assume that the pure doctrine is to be looked for in every one of the author's works. To take a particular but crucial instance, is it not dangerous to interpret *Bussy d'Ambois* by what Chapman said half a dozen years later in its sequel? It is in Clermont's play, not Bussy's, that the Guise complains that Bussy lacked the learning with which Clermont seasons valour and 'was rapt with outrage oftentimes Beyond decorum'. In a perhaps comparable case, Mr. Eliot has disclosed that he now thinks the hero of *The Family Reunion* a prig and finds his own sympathies drawn rather to the hero's mother; but this does not alter the fact that in the play itself sympathy is directed towards the hero and not towards his mother. Eliot's comment—and perhaps Chapman's—is a legitimate criticism of his own work as he subsequently

judges it, and it affords a valuable insight into the author's mind. But the meaning of a work of literature is not given by such comments; it must come from the imaginative life which is in the work itself.

The same consideration suggests that it is possible, in interpreting Chapman's tragedies, to place too much emphasis on Elizabethan tragic theory. The dedicatory epistle to *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* shows Chapman to have held the Renaissance view that the function of tragedy was its 'excitation to virtue, and deflection from her contrary'. Mr. Rees accordingly classifies Chapman's tragedies as exemplary or cautionary. Clermont, Cato, Chabot offer models for emulation, while Bussy and Byron show what their creator 'believed a virtuous man should avoid'. But even if Byron's own actions often contradict his words, do we feel no exultation at his famous cry,

> Give me a spirit that on this life's rough sea
> Loves t'have his sails fill'd with a lusty wind?

However surfeited with Bussy's swagger, have we no admiration for the hero who, surrounded by his executioners, proclaims himself 'up and ready', 'at all parts buckled in [his] fate', his body standing 'like a Roman statue', while his soul 'is hasting To the eternal dwellers'? If Bussy and Byron were only cautionary heroes, their tragedies would be less interesting than they are. Elizabethan tragedy is great not through its theory of the moral exemplum but in spite of it. In exhibiting sinners who are overthrown it may also endow them with a spirit which challenges their destiny and transcends their crimes. This is so with Faustus, with Macbeth, and I think with Bussy. Mr. Rees, it is true, sees the cautionary heroes as finely endowed men who waste their powers; but in his well-documented survey of a tragic dramatist's code of ethics, has not a little of the pity and terror been left out?

HAROLD JENKINS

Teague, Shenkin and Sawney. Being an historical study of the earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish characters in English plays. By J. O. BARTLEY. Pp. xiv+339. Cork: University Press, 1954. 25*s*. net.

Dr. Bartley has written one of those unselfish, admirably methodical studies which would have made a better book—in the sense of being more readable—had he given a looser rein to his own appreciative faculties and enjoyed his subject in a larger way. Method is an excellent thing, up to a point; and one is indeed grateful for the care expended on the practical apparatus of reference which enables anyone to look up anything in a moment. But the author has a potentially entertaining hobby-horse, and it would have been pleasant to see this 'Irishman, with Scottish connexions, resident in Wales' (see his publisher's note), not, indeed, 'riding madly off in all directions', but indulging himself and us with some legitimate curvettings and caprioles. It is true that these national types become more and more creatures of stage convention as they develop, and theoretically, therefore, less interesting than their more realistic Elizabethan originals. All the same, it would have given at least one of his readers keen pleasure if Dr. Bartley had really let himself go all-out over a theatrical realization

of the Sir Pertinax Macsycophant of Macklin and Cooke, to demonstrate the rightness of his own belief that—apart from Goldsmith and Sheridan—*The Man of the World* is *the* outstanding comedy of the later eighteenth century, long overdue for a revival.

To which, of course, Dr. Bartley might well reply that his concern is with the printed drama, not the play produced, which is another study. If he is ever tempted to undertake it, he will reap the reward of his own thorough investigation of all the available material, of his impeccable references, his exhaustive bibliography, his several excellent appendixes, and his comprehensive grasp of his subject. He has a most useful appendix on Gaelic and Welsh expressions and words, and another on pronunciation; and for the theatre historian a valuable list of actors and their parts. He has also provided an admirable play-list of 349 items, briefly analysed for their factual relation to the points dealt with in this study, with references for authors, dates, editions, and performances. Nothing, as one may again emphasize, could be more unselfish than the way in which he has made his own research a mine of information for other researchers.

He divides his study into three periods: Elizabethan to Restoration; 1660 to mid-eighteenth century; and 1760 to 1800. In each he deals with costume, speech, and character traits as the basic elements which make up the 'composite picture' of the increasingly conventional stage-type. Briefly, his finding is that the Welsh character almost disappears by the eighteenth century, and that throughout the periods under consideration the Irish are the most and the Scots the least exaggerated and conventionalized. Some twenty-seven of his half-tone illustrations are devoted to showing us either the contemporary or the definitely theatrical ideas of these national costumes, and the element of caricature which entered into stage representation. The items on the whole are well selected, but the reduction in size necessitated by getting either two or four reproductions into the 8½- by 5½-inch page very much diminishes their effectiveness, and has rendered the famous painting of Lacy as Sauny the Scot almost invisible and consequently useless. Both text and illustrations burke one of the most interesting problems which confronts the student who really wants to 'see' these characters as they appeared on the stage. We know how Garrick dressed Macbeth: we would like to know whether Dr. Bartley thinks that the little we know about the stage costume of Scots in the time of Eliza and our James gives us any grounds for reasonable conjecture as to the costume worn by Burbage. One can show what Macklin wore in 1773, and it was *not* the kilt. What we still want to know is, who first introduced the kilt to the English stage? It was there by the time Kemble was playing Macbeth, and trews, of course, were already well established. But when did the *feileadh beag*, as distinct from the *feileadh mòr* worn by Lacy, first appear? To which Method can reply, Macbeth is not a national type, and outside the terms of reference.

The ease with which Dr. Bartley's book tempts a reviewer into theatrical excursions of this kind suggests that it is likely to stimulate further research along theatrical lines. He is under no illusions as to the artistic merits of the majority of the plays with which he is dealing, and this of itself is likely to call attention to the possible theatrical values of some of the lesser-known specimens. Within

his self-imposed limits he has done a thoroughly sound job, and his study will surely take its place as the standard reference book for all students of the drama who are interested in these three national types which, with the Irishman well ahead since 1700, have maintained their popularity in our theatre since Shakespeare's time.

M. St. Clare Byrne

The Poems of Richard Corbett. Edited by J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper. Pp. lxv+177. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 30s. net.

This is the first edition of Corbett's poems to appear since Gilchrist's of 1807 was incorporated in Chalmers's *English Poets* in 1810. Before that there were only the imperfect collections published in the seventeenth century, of which *Poetica Stromata* (1648) was the best. Corbett died in 1635 without having brought out any collection of his own, and various pieces of verse have been wrongly attributed to him. No more than forty-two are now put forward as genuine, with seven more classed as *dubia*. The rejections are convincingly explained.

It is a slender survival but it repays attention not only for its topical interest (Corbett spent thirty years of his life in Oxford, attaining to the bishopric in 1628) but because it shows how he earned his reputation as wit, satirist, and poet. He had no heavyweight pretensions, and many of his poems are both occasional and facetious; but a deeper vein appears at times and his style could be serious and accomplished as well as amusingly informal. Coleridge commended 'the inimitable humour and propulsive movements of the verse'. Those who have wished to read Corbett during the last 150 years have been well served by Gilchrist's edition, but it was time that the canon and text should be more exactly determined, and the poems more fully introduced and annotated. By seeing to all these things with great competence Messrs. Bennett and Trevor-Roper have produced what will surely long remain the standard edition.

The poems are printed in their chronological order, an advantage made possible by their having most often been written for identifiable occasions. In the correction of errors in previous texts good use has been made of contemporary miscellanies, printed or manuscript, though the editors have stopped short of giving a full *apparatus criticus*, which they consider 'neither practicable nor desirable' in this instance. Corbett frequently figures in commonplace books, which as usual yield texts of varying reliability, and include copyists' errors of no significance. A full list of manuscripts consulted is supplied, though not of the poems which each manuscript contains.

Corbett's writings today have at least as much historical as literary importance, and a special welcome is due to the historical and biographical features of this edition, the accurate and entertaining account of his life, and the notes on his allusions to persons and events of the time. (It is interesting to find in one of these that the Burton referred to in the 'Letter to Master Ailesbury' may be identified with the anatomist of melancholy.) The absence of page-number links between the notes and the poems is an inconvenience, but a small one to set against the value of the notes themselves.

L. C. Martin

Sir Thomas Browne. ***Religio Medici.*** Edited from the manuscript copies and the early editions by JEAN-JACQUES DENONAIN. Pp. xliv+120. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. 25*s.* net. New edition. Pp. xxii+102. 1955. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Scholars who despairingly suppose that all the texts worth editing have long ago been satisfactorily settled may take new heart from a study of M. Denonain's edition of the *Religio Medici*. M. Denonain himself, when he visited Oxford for the purpose of 'gathering documents for what was to be merely a reprint of the extant text of *Religio Medici*', little thought into what depths of textual research his inquiry would lead him. Ten minutes' study of the manuscript preserved at Pembroke showed him that it was an important authority which no previous editor had taken into account—important not only for its variant readings, but also for its quite considerable additions to the text.

Besides this manuscript ('P'), M. Denonain made the first full collation (even, in some cases, the first collation) of seven other manuscripts. His examination convinced him (and his exposition will convince his readers) that the manuscripts preserve two distinct versions of the text. P and one other (a Lansdowne MS. in the British Museum, which contains only about a quarter of the work) present an early version (most easily recognizable by its section-divisions of the contents); the remaining six ('Group II') present a later version, enlarged and revised by Browne himself. M. Denonain has traced the relationships between the manuscripts of the second group as far, probably, as it is possible to do: 'The intricate similarities and dissimilarities do not allow of a more precise and clear-cut grouping' than he suggests. What can be said of them is that they must all 'have had one common source, viz. a revised manuscript in Browne's own hand-writing'.

The revised version differs from the earlier in the following points: (i) it adds a whole section, sixty-nine 'major passages', and more than two hundred phrases and words; (ii) it omits (in most cases probably deliberately) twenty 'major passages' and 235 'phrases, names, or words'; and (iii) it alters 'more than eleven hundred passages, phrases, or words'.

The differences are such as fully to justify M. Denonain in speaking of two versions of the text, in treating P's version as the earlier, and in attributing the revision to Browne himself. All this is pioneer work on the part of M. Denonain.

Before turning to the printed texts, it is worth observing that most of these manuscripts (with others, not surviving, whose existence can be inferred from theirs) must have come into being in the short space between the composition of the work in 1635 and its first appearance in print in 1642—a striking proof of the extent to which manuscript copies of a quite considerable work might be multiplied in the mid-seventeenth century.

The printed texts present problems hardly less complicated than the manuscripts. It has long been recognized that a distinction must be made between the text of the unauthorized editions of 1642 on the one hand and the 'authorized' text represented by the editions of, and subsequent to, 1643 on the other. (M. Denonain gives good reasons for restoring the previously accepted order of priority of the two unauthorized editions reversed by Keynes in his Bibliography.) Comparison with the manuscripts shows that the 1642 text is derived from a

manuscript of Group II, and that the manuscript of this group which it resembles most closely is 'W', a Wilkin MS. at Norwich, 'the most corrupt MS. copy and the remotest from any original in Browne's hand'. Browne was therefore justified in stigmatizing the text of the unauthorized issues as being so 'disguised' that the author 'could not acknowledge it'.

What is the basis of the authorized text—called on its title-page 'a True and full Coppy'—of 1643? Hitherto it has been supposed that Browne supplied the publisher (who was himself responsible for the surreptitious editions of the preceding year) with his own original unadulterated manuscript of the text.

M. Denonain invalidates this hypothesis by showing that 1643 reproduces (and on nineteen occasions corrects in its *Errata*) a number of errors which occur nowhere else but in 1642, and a number which 1642 derives from the corrupted W: 'The "True Coppy" reproduces *very numerous* mistakes which mar the "imperfect" editions.' It seems an inevitable conclusion that the 'copy' which Browne supplied to the printer, so far from being an original, unadulterated manuscript, was actually a copy of one of the issues of the 1642 edition. Of course it was not without revisions by Browne: his 'emendations upon the unauthorized version', according to M. Denonain, 'amount to more than six hundred and fifty items', and most of these evidently result from a checking of the text with a good manuscript of Group II.

In the course of thus revising the text of 1642, Browne was liable to do several kinds of thing.

(1) Often he corrected a mistake derived by 1642 from W (or one of its close relations), rescuing the right reading from the manuscript of Group II by reference to which he was checking the text.

(2) (*a*) Sometimes, simply because he worked quickly and carelessly, he omitted to correct 1642's errors (though, as we have seen, he picked up nineteen of these later and put them right in the *Errata*). (*b*) Sometimes he actually introduced fresh errors of his own. (*c*) 'In several cases', says M. Denonain, 'he only half corrected the mistake', and at one point 'he seems to have misconstrued his own sentence'.

(3) Sometimes Browne added, omitted, or altered on his own account: he wished to modify the text at points where it was correctly transmitted by 1642, either by cancelling passages which were 'familiar, or too personal, or unorthodox', or by altering passages where he had changed his ideas or found a better mode of expressing them, or by adding words or phrases intended to develop his meaning. He also added four whole sections and 'a dozen passages ranging from a few lines to a whole page'.

M. Denonain has also done pioneer work on the later editions of the *Religio Medici*. Ten printed editions of the text appeared in the seventeenth century after 1643, and M. Denonain has collated these exhaustively, as none of his predecessors attempted to do. His examination shows that although Browne tinkered with the text down to his dying day—so that an editor cannot afford to disregard completely any of these editions—he never systematically revised or checked it; most later variants are due to printers' errors, and the text shows a progressive deterioration. M. Denonain thus has no difficulty in showing that Greenhill

(whose text has become a sort of *textus receptus* for later editors) was wrong in accepting the text of 1682, which was the last published in the author's lifetime, as Browne's 'authorized version'.

The work of M. Denonain has so illuminated the history of the text and the relations between the manuscript and printed authorities for it that most of the variants can be explained as falling into one or other of the categories indicated above. But they cannot all be so neatly classified.

Often, it seems, Browne (correcting, by reference to a manuscript of Group II, a printed text founded on W) reverted 'to readings accurately given by P'. How can this have happened? One must, it seems, suppose that he had recourse also to a manuscript of Group I, and thence rescued the text of the original version preserved by P—though such a proceeding seems hard to reconcile with his quick and superficial method of revision.

There is also a large class of readings which present to the editor what he calls a 'most perplexing dilemma', described by him as follows: 'Ought we to adopt the presumably correct readings as given in earlier manuscripts, or the presumably faulty variants of later manuscripts and printed editions which, *after all*, were more or less endorsed by Browne in 1643?' Time and again a reading appears in 1642 and later editions which, though not an undoubted error, is intrinsically inferior to the variant to be found in some or all of the manuscripts; the inferior reading has evidently been 'passed' by Browne in the copy of 1642 which he sent to the press. Which is the editor to prefer?

M. Denonain does not hold that by 'passing' a reading Browne conferred on it a sovereign authority; and he is right in this, for Browne's revision was, as has been seen, a very careless process, and on a number of occasions his 'passing' of a reading was due merely to an oversight. The fact that a 'Group II' reading has survived into 1643, therefore, should not give it a passport into the text.

Now although P gives not only an earlier, but also a purer, text than the manuscripts of Group II, it is none the less the case that these latter manuscripts offer, besides a large number of inferior variants due to corruption (and a large number of improvements due to Browne's revision of the text), a number of variants which represent true readings that have been corrupted by scribal errors in P. The manuscripts of Group II (and the printed editions derived from them), being independent of P, sometimes preserve the true text at points where P has lost it.

Having thus demonstrated the relations between the two main lines of textual authority M. Denonain, very properly, declines in cases of doubt to accept either as authoritative: 'I have', he says, 'minutely analysed the value of each variant as a separate problem, and finally decided which was the best.'

Enough has been said to show that M. Denonain's researches have thrown a flood of light on the history of the text of the *Religio*, and have enabled him to establish hitherto unsuspected *criteria* by which to judge between rival authorities and rival readings. His version (with its 360 manuscript readings admitted for the first time to the text and its numerous additions from the Pembroke MS.) supersedes all the texts that have preceded it, just as his *apparatus* (with its record of 3,450 variants) eclipses the efforts of all Browne's previous editors.

But it must be recorded that in choosing between variants M. Denonain's judgement is far from impeccable. Since his publishers claim that his text 'is now the standard one', and have reprinted it in a cheap form without the textual introduction and apparatus which constitute, so to speak, its credentials, it will not be amiss to examine it in some detail.

M. Denonain betrays inexperience in dealing with seventeenth-century texts by the somewhat naïve remark on p. xi that the Pembroke MS. 'is fairly legible, in spite of the archaic handwriting' and by the suggestion (p. xli) that the familiar contemporary spelling *sixt* is a misprint for *sixth*. On p. xl he shows a similar ignorance of the spelling *fift*, suggesting that *Paul the first* is a historical mistake of the author's for *Paul the fifth*, when it is clear that *first* is a corruption of *fift*, which a scribe or compositor could easily mistake for *firſt*.

M. Denonain does not realize how prone copyists are to fall into the error of homoeoteleuton, and this leads him sometimes to misinterpret the evidence; e.g. at l. 2249: 'And surely there goes a great deal of conscience to the compiling of an History, *there is no reproach to the scandal of a Story*; it is such an Authenticke kinde of falsehood that with authority belies our good names to all Nations and Posteritie.' The words I have italicized are omitted in P alone of the authorities; M. Denonain says that they were 'added later'. They can hardly have been added later, for the passage makes no sense without them. Plainly, they were in the archetype of P and all other manuscripts and were omitted simply because the eye of the scribe who copied P or one of its intermediate ancestors skipped from *History* to *Story*.

An editor who is capable of so misunderstanding the genesis of textual errors is likely to make mistakes when he comes to choose between variants. Half a dozen examples will show that neither M. Denonain's reasoning nor his judgement is faultless in this, perhaps the most important part of the business of the editor of a text.

(1) M. Denonain draws attention in his Introduction to the problem arising where the MSS. PL, which transmit Browne's original version, are in conflict with the manuscripts of Group II and the printed editions. In such cases, he says, he 'minutely analysed the value' of the variants and 'finally decided which was best'. He draws attention to two examples of such 'decisions' on his part; one of them is not a happy one:

> l. 323 that terrible terme *Predestination* . . . is in respect of God no previous determination of our estates to come, but a definitive placet of his will already fulfilled, and at the instant that he first decreed it. . . .

PL read *placet*; the other manuscripts and all printed editions read *blast*, which M. Denonain adopts, supposing, presumably, either that *placet* is a scribal error or that it was discarded by Browne in favour of *blast* when he produced his revised version of the text. But no copyist with *blast* before him would manufacture *placet* out of it, and no author who had written *placet* would 'improve' his text by substituting the inferior, if not meaningless, 'blast'. *Blast* is simply a scribe's misreading of the unfamiliar *placet*, which Browne omitted to correct when revising 1642 for the press. The case for *placet* is supported strongly by a passage

in Part I (§ 59): 'That which is the cause of my election, I hold to be the cause of my salvation, which was the mercy and beneplacit of God, before I was, or the foundation of the world.'

(2) A superior reading offered by P is likewise rejected in l. 1039:

> Those that to confute their incredulity desire to see apparitions, shall questionlesse never behold any, nor have the power to be so much as Witches; the Devill hath them already in a heresie as capitall as Witchcraft; and to appeare to them, were but to convert them.

So M. Denonain, following all his authorities except P, which preserves 'the power to see so much as Witches'—a variant which surely has only to be understood in order to be adopted (the devil will not 'appeare to them' and so they will not 'see so much as Witches' see, viz. apparitions of the devil).

(3) The edition of 1672, like other later editions, offers readings about some of which M. Denonain rightly says that it is difficult to know whether they are the work of the printer or corrections of the author; one of these (he says) occurs in l. 2097:

> But as, in casting of account, three or foure men together come short of one man placed by himself below them: So neither are a troope of these ignorant Doradoes of that true esteeme and value, as many a forlorne person, whose condition doth place them below their feet.

So all editions before 1672, which reads *doth place him below their feet*. M. Denonain retains *them*. *Them* is just defensible (*'many a* forlorne person' might justify the plural pronoun), but *him* is surely correct, and must be the author's correction.

(4) The single emendation that the editor claims as his own (in l. 821) is not a happy one:

> The Church of *Rome* confidently proves the opinion of Tutelary Angels, from that answer, when *Peter* knockt at the doore, *'Tis not he, but his Angel*; that is, might some say, his Messenger, or some body from him; for so the Originall signifies, and is as likely to be the doubtfull Families meaning.

The doubtful Families is the reading of all the manuscripts of Group II and all printed editions; P has *the simple servants*. M. Denonain suggests *Famulus* for *Families* in his first edition, and adopts *Famulies* in his second. Now, *Famulus* makes no sense, and M. Denonain was right to abandon it; but Browne might conceivably have coined 'famuly', a Latinism for 'servant', and plainly, *famulies*, if Browne wrote it, might easily be corrupted into *families*; and superficially the emendation is attractive as providing a link between *servants* and *families*. But a moment's reflection shows that M. Denonain's suggestion does not explain the variants we find: why, if Browne wrote *servants* in his first version, should he alter it to *famulies* in his second? And the supposition that *servants* is a scribe's explanatory gloss on *famulies* would not account for the alteration of *simple* to *doubtful*. Moreover, a glance at the text of *Acts* makes it plain that *famulies* really will not do. The simple servant who reported Peter's arrival had no 'doubt' about who he was, and it was not the servant who used the words

suggesting that it was his angel, but the doubtful (i.e. puzzled) family (Mary the mother of John and James, and those with her).

What happened was that Browne made the mistake (which perhaps M. Denonain has made also) of supposing that it was the servant that used the ambiguous word ἄγγελος; and, labouring under that error, he wrote 'the simple servants meaning'. Then, in the course of the revision which produced the text preserved by Group II, he realized that it was not the servant that used the word but her puzzled hearers, and substituted 'the doubtful Families'.

(5) M. Denonain prints another unhappy conjecture of his own in Browne's preface:

> I had not the assistance (says Browne) of any good booke . . . and therefore there might be many reall lapses therein, which others might take notice of, and more that I suspected my selfe.

So read all the authorities, and the text is perfectly satisfactory. M. Denonain, on the strength of a misunderstanding of the last six words, prints 'more than I suspected myself', and claims that his conjecture is supported by the Latin translation—'pauciores quam ipse suspicarer'—which in fact is a translation of the text as it stands and not of the text as he would have us read it. (He was so struck, presumably, by *quam* ('than') that he did not realize that *pauciores* is not equivalent to *plures*).

(6) At l. 2648, M. Denonain prints the following:

> I am above *Atlas* his shoulders [, and, though I seeme on earth to stand, on tiptoe in heaven.]

His note on the bracketed words is 'found in P alone (editor's punctuation)'. Surely he has altered the punctuation because he misread the manuscript, which must read 'and, though I seeme on earth, do stand on tiptoe in heaven.'?

(7) A failure to appreciate the meaning of his author leads M. Denonain to vitiate the text at l. 1383:

> The smattering I have of the Philosophers stone (which is something more than the perfect exaltation of gold) hath taught me a great deale of Divinity.

This is Browne's authorized text of 1643; in 1642 he found the reading *nothing else but the perfect exaltation of gold*. P and four other manuscripts read *God* for *gold*, and M. Denonain adopts this, observing 'Browne failed to see the real mistake and altered the meaning'. This is surely to deal hardly with one's author. The editor assumes that *gold* was a mistake for *God*, that Browne failed to observe this, and that his mistake necessitated a change of *nothing else but* into *something more than*. But 'the exaltation of God' is meaningless as applied to the philosopher's stone; 'exaltation' is a technical term of alchemy which fits in well with 'gold'. The mistake is the editor's, not the author's, and the alteration of *nothing else but* is irrelevant.

The errors of which those pointed out above are a sample are enough to throw doubt on the publishers' claim that M. Denonain has produced a 'final', 'authentic', and 'standard' text of the *Religio*. But it is not only the presence of

erroneous readings that invalidates that claim; it is also the presence of passages of varying length which should have in the final text no place whatever. M. Denonain, as he explains on pp. xxxviii–xxxix of his Introduction, was faced with a difficult problem created by the presence in manuscripts of passages omitted from the authorized printed text. 'Are we to embody the unpublished passages—whether found in P alone, or in the other manuscripts as well—within our text, or shall we relegate them to the critical notes?' He gives his solution as follows: 'I have therefore decided to insert within the text, between [. . .] of course, whatever is not found in the 1643 edition and is not clearly an accident. But I print in the notes whatever has been deliberately superseded by a rearranged version in 1643.'

This is not expressed with perfect clarity. But the effect of it would seem to be that (*a*) if the omission of a passage from 1643 was clearly accidental, it is included in the text with no distinguishing mark; (*b*) if its omission was deliberate and the text has been so altered that it can no longer be accommodated, it is relegated to the *apparatus*; (*c*) all other omitted passages are restored to the text between square brackets. And this is what M. Denonain's practice appears to have been.

No one will quarrel with (*a*) or (*b*); but the effect of (*c*) is that there are retained in the text many passages and phrases which (it is to be presumed) Browne deliberately omitted either when producing the revised version preserved in Group II, or when revising 1642 for the authorized edition; such material is only relegated to the *apparatus* if there has been such 'rearrangement' as makes its retention in the text impracticable. In his *editio major*, M. Denonain distinguished these passages by square brackets; but all such distinguishing marks have disappeared from his second edition, which thus presents a conflated version, in which 'fragments or parts' which, M. Denonain says, 'were left out in the second version of the essay, probably as too personal, undignified, unorthodox, or no longer "fathered" by the author', are reintroduced into the text from which they had been purged by Browne himself.

One can understand M. Denonain's desire to display in his text as much as possible of the material discovered by him in P and other manuscripts, and his procedure was perhaps pardonable so long as this matter was distinguished from the rest of the text and its relation to it explained in introduction and *apparatus*. But there can be no justification for reprinting this hybrid version without any distinguishing marks or any explanatory matter and offering it to the public, as the Cambridge Press has done in the *editio minor*, as an 'authentic' text.

It is by its text alone that M. Denonain's edition must stand or fall. Apart from an undistinguished 'biographical and critical introduction' prefixed to the second edition he has not attempted to make any contribution to the elucidation of his author. If any book requires an illustrative and exegetical commentary it is surely the *Religio*; a bare text must leave even a learned reader with questions in his mind on every page; and even if the 'very little extra' which the Cambridge Press invites us to pay did indeed procure us an 'authentic' text, we should still turn, for all its deficiencies, to Greenhill's Golden Treasury edition, for its illuminating glossary and full and sympathetic notes. JOHN SPARROW

The Poetical Works of John Milton. Edited by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Vol. I: *Paradise Lost*, pp. xxv + 326. 1952. 30*s.* net. Vol. II: *Paradise Regain'd, Samson Agonistes, Poems Upon Severall Occasions Both English and Latin*, pp. xx + 376. 1955. 35*s.* net. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Miss Darbishire's text of *Paradise Lost* has been before the public for three years; now that the second volume has appeared we can assess her work on Milton's poems as a whole. But it is the principles of the text of *Paradise Lost* that govern her whole editorial procedure, which is why she published that volume first; so I shall start by considering that volume, and shall confine my attention to it mainly.

The editor of *Paradise Lost*, as Miss Darbishire says, may seem to have a simple task. Three texts have Milton's authority behind them: the first edition issued, with six varying title-pages and containing many corrected sheets, in 1667, 1668, and 1669; the second edition of 1674; and, for Book I, the manuscript from which the 1667 edition was printed. Study of the manuscript and the editions shows the unremitting care with which they were scrutinized and corrected under Milton's direction. It is significant that there are few verbal errors in any of these versions, and that the bulk of the corrections are in the minutiae of spelling and pointing; the proof of the unrelenting control exercised by the blind Milton is that he eventually succeeded in getting his own spelling and pointing so far reproduced as to enable us to recognize the rules to which he worked. 'Is there then', asks Miss Darbishire, 'more for an editor to do than print his text from one or other of these editions, record vital variants, and correct minor errors? I believe that there is a case for a reformed text, a text not modernized but, on the contrary, brought as near as possible to that which Milton intended.' It is precisely because Milton under adverse conditions came so astonishingly near to getting his poem printed just as he wanted that an editor is enabled and required to try and perfect the work. And so Miss Darbishire has aimed at constructing a text that 'represents more nearly than any previous printing of *Paradise Lost*, what Milton would have achieved if he had had his sight'. This is a proper ambition in an editor of *Paradise Lost*, and there is no living scholar better equipped for the attempt than Miss Darbishire. Following on her notable studies on the manuscript of Book I and on the various issues of the first edition, she presents and examines in the introduction, textual notes, and appendixes to her volume, more thoroughly than it has ever been done before, the material from which something like such an ideal text could be made. Her edition will be a basic work for future editors. Yet she has not herself given us, I think, the ideal text at which she aimed. Her text will remain of the highest interest and value to scholars, but her very authority in this field makes it all the more necessary to distinguish those respects in which her text is justified from those in which it is doubtful or demonstrably wrong.

The first point on which one joins issue with her is her choice of the first edition as the basis of her text. In her *The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost Book I* (1931) she wrote, 'A wise editor of *Paradise Lost* . . . will base his text upon the second edition, since it embodies the author's latest corrections.' This was the view of Jonathan Richardson; Grierson in the introduction to his

edition in 1925 supported it with an impressive array of second-edition readings that are clearly preferable to those of the first edition; the Columbia editors had no hesitation in reprinting the text of the second edition. It has become in fact the accepted view that there is a progressive improvement in the printed text up to the final edition of 1674; and Miss Darbishire makes out no case for reversing that view. She says that 'Milton exercised a more thorough supervision . . . over the first edition', and that 'the second edition has not received the same close attention from Milton as the first in its conduct through the printing-press'; but her ground for these assertions seems to be that whereas the six issues of the first edition contain many corrected sheets, differences between sheets in copies of the second edition are fewer and less important. That fewer corrected sheets prove less careful supervision is surely a ***non-sequitur***. The first sheets of the first edition contained many errors to be corrected; the printer of the second edition could and for the most part did avail himself of these corrections. The proper question to ask is not which is the more corrected edition but which is the more correct. Miss Darbishire does indeed give her answer to this question: 'for the minutiae of the text I have found it [the first edition], on balance, the more accurate and the more faithful to Milton's intentions'. But she is contradicted by the facts.

Miss Darbishire lists in an appendix all the variants in the corrected and uncorrected sheets of the first edition, noting alongside the readings adopted in the second edition; this supplies her only direct evidence of the superiority of the first edition, and it amounts to very little. As announced in an article in this journal as long ago as 1941, she has found sheets in different states in fourteen outer or inner formes among copies of the first edition; in addition 'two sheets, Z and Vv (a half-sheet), appear in some copies of the sixth issue, 1669, completely reset and reprinted in a much less correct state than those of the earlier copies. Mr. H. F. Fletcher in his Facsimile Edition of Milton's *Poetical Works* has noted further: C inner, D inner, and L inner'. Now the second edition agrees with the 'corrected' sheets in all but five of Miss Darbishire's fourteen formes, and in all but sixteen of some 185 variants listed by her. In eleven of these sixteen variants the 'corrected' sheets of the first edition do correct the second edition in a spelling or pointing; in four (iii. 630, iii. 737, iv. 100, iv. 720) both readings are good; in the remaining one both readings again are good:

Hence fills and empties to enlighten th' Earth (iii. 731)

th' Earth *Ed. 2*] the Earth *Ed. 1* '*corr.*'. In the first reading '*to en*lighten' is not elided, in the second reading it is; Miss Darbishire adopts *the Earth* in her text but then unnecessarily seeks to justify the metre by silently introducing the emendation *enlight'n*, although such elision of a syllabic *n*, as we shall see later, is only possible before a vowel.

These corrected sheets of the first edition, then, correct the second edition at eleven places. How slight a ground this is for preferring the first to the second edition as a textual basis is revealed when we turn from these particular sheets to note how much more often the second edition corrects the first edition than vice versa in the whole course of the poem. Leaving out of account the emphatic

and unemphatic forms of the personal pronouns, in which the second edition is admittedly more accurate, a rough estimate made from Miss Darbishire's own 'Textual Commentary' shows that, despite her prejudice in favour of the first edition, she prefers second-edition to first-edition readings in the proportion of about 90 to 50. As for the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns, the second edition corrects first-edition *their* to *thir* (to take only one example) forty-one times in the first three books; it makes only two mistakes in the whole poem on this point (leaving the first edition *their* at vi. 690 and x. 440). Its greater accuracy over these emphatic and unemphatic forms alone proves how closely the printing of the second edition was watched over. In the face of these facts one is puzzled by Miss Darbishire's statement of her editorial procedure:

> I have followed the second edition in its division of the poem into twelve books, and in its revision of a few passages, but I have taken as the basis of my text the first edition, corrected in some details by the second, and by the manuscript as far as it goes. I have adopted an occasional correction made in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth editions, published in 1678, 1688, 1691, and 1695, and some made by Tickell, by Fenton, and by Bentley; and I have introduced a few of my own.

It is obviously true that she is bent on following the first edition as far as possible, and this attitude not infrequently misleads her judgement; yet 'corrected in some details by the second' is a gross understatement of the extent to which she has been compelled to follow the second against the first edition. In theory Miss Darbishire not only removes the second edition from pride of place, as the consummation of all Milton's efforts to get his poem printed as he wished, but she destroys its authority as an original text, except for its patent revisions: on her view its many variants can scarcely claim more authenticity than those of the posthumous editions, Tickell, Fenton, and Bentley and all. In theory she rejects, in practice she confirms its authority, though not as thoroughly as one would like.

I shall consider first two verbal cruces and one of punctuation in Book I, on which Miss Darbishire and I have previously disagreed. The first one illustrates her prejudice in favour of the first edition, the other two her preference for the manuscript.

i. 703. founded *MS., Ed. 1*] found out *Ed. 2*.

founded has been accepted as the true reading since Bentley. I stated the case for *found out* in a letter to *T.L.S.*, 9 August 1934, to which Miss Darbishire refers; but since she remains unconvinced I must restate the case more completely. For this purpose it is necessary to take the whole passage describing how the devils, under Mammon's direction, perform three distinct operations in getting and working the metal for Pandaemonium: one gang mines the ore, a second extracts the metal from the ore and refines it, a third founds or casts the metal. It is a clear account of the three industrial processes involved and contains a number of technical terms accurately used. I quote the second edition:

> There stood a Hill not far whose griesly top
> Belch'd fire and rowling smoak; the rest entire

Shon with a glossie scurff, undoubted sign
That in his womb was hid metallic Ore,
The work of Sulphur. . . .
. . . Soon had his crew
Op'nd into the Hill a spacious wound
And dig'd out ribs of Gold . . .
Nigh on the Plain in many cells prepar'd,
That underneath had veins of liquid fire
Sluc'd from the Lake, a second multitude
With wondrous Art found out the massie Ore,
Severing each kind, and scum'd the Bullion dross:
A third as soon had form'd within the ground
A various mould, and from the boyling cells
By strange conveyance fill'd each hollow nook. (i. 670–707).

Bentley called *found out* 'a vile Fault . . . instead of *Founded*, melted, from *Fundere*'. All editors since have agreed with him, and have accepted his gloss on *founded*; Miss Darbishire does so, and says in bold Bentleian vein, ' "found out" is an ignorant correction at the printing house'. But it is Bentley's gloss that is ignorant. To found does not mean to melt but to pour molten metal into a mould; the melting is only a necessary preliminary to the pouring, which is itself the prior meaning of *fundere*. Miss Darbishire quotes from Dr. Johnson's definition of 'found', insinuating that he supports the meaning 'melt down'; but Johnson commits no such blunder. His definition is, 'To form by melting and pouring into moulds; to cast.' *O.E.D.* agrees with Johnson, and gives no authority for the use of the word to mean 'melt'. In short *found* is a technical term with a precise meaning. The operation performed by the third gang of devils is founding, and is accurately described by Milton. The term was wrongly applied in the first edition to the second of these operations, and that is why it was altered. It was no ignorant correction.

But why this ungainly 'found out'? One might think *smelted* would have been neater; for smelt means melt ore to extract the metal, which is the gist of this second operation. But *smelted* would have added nothing to the description, since the previous lines (700–2) have told us that the treatment was by smelting; what was wanted was a verb to express the next stage in the work, the process defined by the qualifying phrase *severing each kind*. To understand what this next stage was calls for a little knowledge of mineralogy and metallurgy such as Milton and other educated men of his time possessed. The information can be found in Agricola's *De Re Metallica*, which remained the textbook on mining and metallurgy for 180 years after its publication in 1556; or in Sir John Pettus's *Fleta Minor* (London, 1686). First, there is the difference between *metallic Ore* (l. 673) and *massie Ore* (l. 703); Miss Darbishire misses the difference when she argues that *found out the massie Ore* cannot be right 'since the fiends had already "digged out (the) ribs of Gold" (l. 690)'. Ore is a compound of metalliferous and non-metalliferous minerals, the latter (such as earth and rock) being called gangue. This compound is the *metallic Ore*. The *ribs of Gold* (l. 690) dug out are not pure gold but gold mixed with other metals and gangue; ribs is a technical

term for parts of the 'veins' of ore in rock. For the miner there are two types of gold: 'reef' gold deposited in veins of rock, and 'alluvial' gold washed down from the rock and deposited in a comparatively pure state in the gravel and sand of rivers. Milton's gold is reef gold. What the second gang of devils receive from the miners, then, is the gross ore; and their job is to 'separate' the gold from the other metals and the gangue. Pettus in his *Essays on Metallic Words* gives this definition of 'Separation': 'a distinguishing or dividing mixt Metals from each other, or other matters adherent to the Metals'. 'Other matters' are the gangue; 'dividing mixt Metals' explains Milton's *severing each kind*. As Pettus says, 'no Oar hath Gold only of it self, without other incorporated Metals' (p. 99). The *massie Ore* (l. 703) is the gold extracted from this *metallic Ore*. This different use of 'ore' to mean the pure metal itself, especially the precious metals gold and silver, is chiefly poetic; Milton in his poetry uses the word five times in this sense, and only twice in the sense of crude ore. The epithet *massie* indicates this sense here, for not only was it a stock epithet for gold and silver but it stresses a crucial fact in the process of 'separation' being described, viz. that gold has a higher density or specific gravity than the materials in which it is embedded. The meaning of *found out* is now obvious enough in its context. To find out is to discover by searching and scrutiny, to detect and obtain with difficulty, as at ii. 406:

> who shall tempt with wandring feet
> The dark unbottom'd infinite Abyss
> And through the palpable obscure find out
> His uncouth way, . . .?

Those who first practised the 'mystery' of metallurgy were also finding out an uncouth way, and it was something to marvel at; but where would be the *wondrous Art* in just melting the ore, since plenty of fire was to hand? It only remains to say of these lines that *scum'd the Bullion dross* describes the last of this second lot of operations, the refining of the separated gold. *scum'd* is the technical term for the removal of the dross; *Bullion* is the technical term for precious metal in the mass. Finally, to confirm my interpretation, I will quote Pettus's account of the operations performed by Milton's first two gangs (*Essays on Metallic Words*, under *Alchemist*). He starts by defining an Alchemist as a 'Chemist, Melter, Prover, Assayer or Extractor of Quintessences. . . . But before we fix our Title or Epithete to the master of this Science, it is fit to shew the progresses of it; at the first step to it he is called a Miner, or he that finds out and digs (or causes to be dig'd) the *Metallic* Oar out of such mines.' Here is Milton's *metallic Ore*. Then after specifying the cleansing processes, he goes on: 'The Fourth is the Smelter of the great quantities in those great Ovens or Furnaces. The Fifth is the Finer that melts them over again, and separates the Metals in the great Works. The Sixth is the Refiner that melts them again so often as he thinks fit, till he hath brought the separated Metals to their several perfections and intireness.' Here are the successive steps of the second process exactly as described by Milton. And when Milton proceeded to describe the 'founding' of the metal for Pandaemonium in the immediately succeeding lines, surely he knew that this was the word for it. How the original mistake of

founded in l. 703 occurred, whether by a slip of Milton's or a mishearing of his amanuensis, we cannot know; at any rate he used the word again correctly later in the poem when describing the manufacture of cannon by the revolted angels in Heaven:

> Part hidden veins digg'd up (nor hath this Earth
> Entrails unlike) of Mineral and Stone,
> Wherof to found thir Engins and thir Balls
> Of missive ruin. (vi. 516–19)

Here we have *veins of Mineral and Stone* instead of *ribs of metallic Ore*. Pearce made the right comment when he said that by *stone* Milton may have meant 'that the metal, of which they made their *engines* and *balls*, was inclos'd in and Mix't with a stony substance in the mine'. To sum up, *founded* is an error and cannot stand in the face of correction in the second edition; *found out* may or may not be what Milton first dictated, but it is an accurate expression; nor can it be thought ungainly when it is seen to say what he meant. I hope this may settle the matter, for I confess I am heartily sick of it myself.

i. 756. Pandaemonium, the high Capital *Edd. 1, 2*] Capitoll *corr. to* Capitall *MS.*

Miss Darbishire persists in her opinion, first argued in *The Manuscript of Paradise Lost Book I*, that 'Capitol' is the right reading: 'I believe that some officious and unauthorized hand made the alteration in the MS. . . . Bentley here lost a golden opportunity.' Her ignorant corrector at l. 703 is now joined by an officious one: they seem—if ghosts can propagate—the progeny indeed of Bentley's notorious Editor. These supposititious felons cut the ground from under all rational textual criticism, including Miss Darbishire's own; for everything proceeds on the basis of the authenticity of the original texts. Where the texts differ we must judge the variants on their intrinsic merits; but to doubt a correction in the manuscript that is supported by both editions is to doubt all. Her arguments in support of *Capitol* are certainly a true and illuminating commentary on the poet's original idea of Pandaemonium as described in Book I; for it is there described throughout as a single edifice, 'the Palace of Satan' as it is called in the *Argument*; and *Capitol* is the just and crowning stroke of description. But the question is whether Milton's idea of Pandaemonium changed with the needs of the story; and there is irrefutable evidence that it did, though Miss Darbishire will not allow her attention to be drawn to it. Pandaemonium is named and described again in Book X, and it has now become a *city*, a *seat*, a *metropolis*. When Satan returns to Hell he finds the countryside deserted and all his subjects

> Farr to the inland retir'd, about the walls
> Of *Pandaemonium*, Citie and proud seate
> Of *Lucifer*, . . . (423–5)
>
> There kept thir Watch the Legions, while the Grand
> In Council sate, . . . (427–8)
>
> . . . So these the late
> Heav'n-banisht Host left desert utmost Hell
> Many a dark League, reduc't in careful Watch
> Round thir Metropolis, . . . (436–9)

seate (l. 424) is clearly used in the sense thus defined in *O.E.D.*: 'A city in which a throne, court, government is established or set up; a capital.' Satan then passes unnoticed through the crowded city to the palace or 'Capitol' described in Book I, where 'the Grand In Council sate':

> and from the dore
> Of that *Plutonian* Hall, invisible
> Ascended his high Throne, . . . (443–5)

Pandaemonium, the high Capitol of Book I has become *that Plutonian Hall*, a citadel within a city; and it is the latter that is now expressly called Pandaemonium. That was why it became necessary to alter *Capitol* to *Capital* at i. 756. Was it a discrepancy the poet could ignore? And who if not Milton would recollect that outstanding *Pandaemonium, the high Capitol* as he dictated *Pandaemonium, Citie and proud seate*? In this whole passage in Book X he holds all the earlier description of Pandaemonium in mind, and in his wonted way refers us back to it by echoing its phrases. It is true that *Capital* does not really fit the description in Book I, and one may suppose the poet regretted the loss of that magnificent *Capitol* as keenly as any editor: but what else was he to do? Pandaemonium has developed with the needs of the story; the story requires that Satan return not merely to a palace but to a city where all his legions (the whole boiling soon to be transformed before his eyes to serpents) can congregate; and this thronging capital city can bear no other name than Pandaemonium. Is the poet then to rewrite that glorious description of the building of Pandaemonium? It is too much to ask, even of a Milton. Besides, the creation of an entire city could not have the striking imaginative force of the single 'ascending pile'. Once we have seen the necessity for altering that *o* to *a* we have no difficulty, I think, in accepting the description of the building of Pandaemonium as symbolic of the building of a city. In any case, there it is. For once we can watch the poet not merely correcting spelling and punctuation but handling one of those unforeseen discrepancies that must sometimes happen in the long course of an epic poem. And to assume that we know better than the poet strikes me as presumptuous.

i. 229–30. fire, . . . hew; *MS.*] fire; . . . hue, *Edd. 1, 2.*

These lines occur in the passage describing how Satan leaves the burning lake of Hell to alight on the no less fiery land. I quote the whole passage from the second edition, italicizing the lines in question:

> Forthwith upright he rears from off the Pool
> His mighty Stature; on each hand the flames
> Drivn backward slope thir pointing spires, and rowld
> In billows, leave i' th' midst a horrid Vale.
> Then with expanded wings he stears his flight
> Aloft, incumbent on the dusky Air
> That felt unusual weight, till on dry Land
> He lights, if it were Land that ever burn'd
> *With solid, as the Lake with liquid fire;*
> *And such appear'd in hue*, as when the force
> Of subterranean wind transports a Hill

> Torn from *Pelorus*, or the shatter'd side
> Of thundring *Aetna*, whose combustible
> And fewel'd entrals thence conceiving Fire,
> Sublim'd with Mineral fury, aid the Winds,
> And leave a singed bottom all involv'd
> With stench and smoak: Such resting found the sole
> Of unblest feet. (221–38)

Miss Darbishire holds to the view, first expressed in her edition of the manuscript of Book I, that the punctuation of the manuscript in ll. 229–30 (fire, . . . hew;) is clearly right because 'it throws the magnificent simile of the volcanic eruption and earthquake into relation with the phenomenon of the fiery liquid-solid land of Hell, while the punctuation of the first edition relates it erroneously to the one aspect of colour'. This is to misconstrue. In the first place 'the phenomenon of the liquid-solid land of Hell' is an invention of Miss Darbishire's: the poet presents no such picture. He describes the burning land as distinct from the burning water; they are both alive with fire, but the liquid fire of the lake is manifestly different from the solid fire of the land—for one thing, Satan can stand and walk on the latter. As so often, Milton proceeds to paint his particular picture of the scene in a simile, introduced by the words 'And such appear'd in hue'; the subject of these words is 'dry Land', not fire, liquid or solid. One would have said it was impossible to mistake the simile for anything but a description of the burning land in contrast to the burning lake. As to Miss Darbishire's objection that the punctuation of the editions relates the simile only to the one aspect of colour, she ignores the fact that if we accept this meaning for 'hue' the manuscript punctuation makes the poet feebly say that the fire was like fire in colour. The real crux, as I pointed out in a note in *R.E.S.*, xxiii (1947), 146–7, lies in the meaning of 'hue', which in the context requires to be taken in the sense, still current at the time, of the whole aspect or look of a thing, including its colour. Given this sense the manuscript reading tells us that the fiery land had the whole look of fire, the printed reading that it had the whole look of the scene of a volcanic eruption. The punctuation of the editions is clearly right.

The textual variants of *Paradise Lost* are, as I have said, mostly in spelling and punctuation; but these things are not unimportant, in Milton's verse at least. We know that he took special care of the spelling and pointing of his verse. He was interested in them as a means of scoring his verse, as guides to the right reading; and neither the syntax nor the prosody of the poem is so simple and obvious that we can afford to neglect this proffered aid. How ever he managed it we cannot know; but Thomas Ellwood says that when he read Latin to Milton, 'having a curious ear, he understood by my tone when I understood what I read and when I did not; and accordingly would stop me, examine me, and open the most difficult passages to me'. And I suppose that Milton, as his verse was read over to him, watched for the false emphasis, pause or stress, or the danger of these, and employed his devices *ad hoc*. These devices are used regularly enough for us to recognize most of the rules to which he worked, but in the circumstances we must be wary of assuming that all inconsistencies, in the spellings at least,

are due to the carelessness of the printer rather than the indifference of the author.

Miss Darbishire thinks the spellings more important than the punctuation; 'the importance of spelling to Milton is the main argument for a reformed text'. I should say the pointing was at least as important; but I do not see how one can draw any such distinction since they are used equally and together to score the verse. As to the spellings, we must distinguish between the spellings of individual words and of groups of words, for it is only with the latter that there can be any question of rules. I shall take the individual spellings first. Miss Darbishire supplies a valuable Word List of Milton's individual spellings, showing the variants, the spelling adopted in her text, and the evidence from the prose as well as the verse on which she relies; it is an impressive array but we must not be misled into thinking it proves more than it does. Above all we must not be misled by Miss Darbishire into thinking these spellings idiosyncratic. She says: 'Critics and editors from Jonathan Richardson downwards have noted the idiosyncrasy of Milton's spellings, and a key-list could readily be compiled which would enable the enquirer to identify a given page of print or manuscript as Milton's and no other's.' She then gives a select list of such spellings, and every one is a variant in common use at the time. Although spelling was becoming gradually more regular during the seventeenth century it was not until the next that anything like a uniform spelling was established even among printers, and not until after Johnson's Dictionary that it was achieved. In Milton's day many words had variant spellings which were used indifferently by writer or printer. Milton in his poetry, however, came more and more to use these variant spellings to show differences in meaning or pronunciation, and above all to point his prosody. It is these uses, not the spellings themselves, that are idiosyncratic.

There is no point, so far as the reader of poetry is concerned, in keeping variant spellings of the same consonantal sound; and in a reformed text surely those spellings may be modernized which Milton himself spells haphazardly in either the modern or some obsolete way or ways, so showing his indifference: *scarse, sence, antient*; *carkases* (*P.L.* i. 310. *Edd.* 1, 2] carcasses *MS.*); *affraid, ofspring*; *sulfur, prophane*; *spight, hautie*. Nor does it help the reader of the poetry to keep such variant vowel spellings as *near, nere, neer*; *yield, yeild, yeeld*; *receive, receave*; *proclaim, proclame*; *persuade, perswade*; *hue, hew*; *gild, guild*; *eye, ey, eie*. Some of these variants, as Miss Darbishire says, are of interest to the phonologist, but if the phonologist wants this material he will go to the original sources, not to a modern revised text. Once an editor departs from his copy text it is puzzling to know where to stop. Miss Darbishire lays down an arbitrary rule:

> When a word of frequent occurrence is printed consistently except for one lapse into an un-Miltonic spelling, I have corrected that single spelling: thus *tearms* at ii. 331, *heards* at vi. 856, the only exceptions to the normal spelling *terms* and *herds*.

By this rule she corrects *sence* to *sense* because *sence* occurs only once, but follows the spelling *scarse* because it occurs more than once, although *scarce* is Milton's normal spelling.

What are unquestionably phonetic spellings are another matter: *buisness*, *forren*, *goverment*, *meddow*, *Parlament*, *sovran*, *verdit*, *voutsafe*. Many of these were older phonetic spellings retained alongside the pedantic spellings introduced after the revival of classical learning. Others represent forms now obsolete: *ammiral*, *alablaster*, *liveless*, *sord* (*sward*). There are a few variants the poet availed himself of for metrical or euphonic reasons, such as *wrath* and *wrauth*.

For the individual spellings it is not necessary to distinguish between *Paradise Lost* and the other poems; it is otherwise with the punctuation and the spelling devices that apply to whole groups of words. These are more complex matters, which must first be examined in *Paradise Lost* before their application to the other poems can be considered; for an understanding of these depends primarily on an understanding of the prosody of *Paradise Lost*. Although Miss Darbishire says that these are guides to the reading of the verse she has nothing to say about Milton's verse, and refers to his prosody only occasionally in the notes. Yet the punctuation and the spelling devices are controlled entirely by prosodical considerations, and an investigation must start from the prosodical facts. In the following account of Milton's prosody I use the term 'accent' arbitrarily for metrical beat, and 'stress' for speech emphasis. The verse of *Paradise Lost* consists of ten metrical syllables (that is not counting either elisions or extra-metrical syllables at the end of line or half-line) with the accents on the even syllables. The tenth and either the fourth or sixth syllables are always stressed, thus anchoring the rhythm of the line to the metrical beat. Besides these fixed stresses there may be stresses at any place in the line, accented or unaccented; a stress at an unaccented place produces reversal of the accent, often bringing two stresses together and making a triple rhythm. These shifting stresses are thus a means of obtaining the varied speech rhythms that counterpoint the metre; other means are contractions and elisions. In English as distinct from Classical prosody it is convenient to follow Bridges in speaking of 'contraction' when a vowel sound is cut out, and of 'elision' when one vowel sound is run into another without being quite lost. Thus, the *ie* of *disobedience* is neither a monophthong nor a disyllable in Milton's verse; the two vowels are both heard but make only one metrical syllable. Elisions therefore, although they do not count metrically, contribute to the rhythm. Bearing in mind that elision is optional or permissive only, one can distinguish two chief rules for elision in *Paradise Lost*: (1) open vowels may be elided, unsounded letters between vowels not counting; (2) unaccented vowels separated by *l*, *n*, or *r* may be elided. All cases under the second rule may be regarded as cases of syllabic *l*, *n*, *r*, in which the vowels in everyday speech are murmur vowels: e.g. *temp*le, *gard*en, *murmur*ing. In Milton's verse these syllables may be, in my sense of the term, 'elided' before a following vowel; that is, the syllable is still heard even though it does not count as a metrical syllable. So, in the first of the following verses the *-en* of *burden* is not elided though in an elidible position; in the second it is elided and the word is a metrical monosyllable:

> Each others burden in our share of woe (x. 961)
> The burd'n of many Ages on me light (xi. 767).

It is also important to note the difference, which Wyld pointed out, between syllablic *n* after a stop consonant (*trodden*, *reckon*, *written*, *open*) or a voiceless open consonant (*listen*, *soften*), which are examples of true syllabic *n*, and in which therefore syllabic *n* only ceases to be a metrical syllable when elided; and on the other hand *-en* or *-on* after *v* and the *z* sound, which can be contracted. Thus *heaven*, *even* (*evening*), *driven*, *chosen*, *prison* can be disyllables or monosyllables irrespective of elision:

> That Shepherd who first taught the *chosen* Seed (i. 8)
>
> Eternal Spirits; or have ye *chos'n* this place (i. 318).

Because she has not noted this distinction Miss Darbishire, as we shall see, goes wrong over Milton's use of the apostrophe to show elision and contraction.

There is always some degree of pause, a dwelling of the voice, at the fixed stresses, even when the sense runs on; but other pauses, due to the grammatical sense and marked by punctuation, may occur at any place from after the first to after the ninth syllable, and these may override the medial pause:

> Seasons return, but not to me returns
> Day, or the sweet approach of E'vn or Morn (iii. 41–42)
>
> And Bush with frizl'd hair implicit; last
> Rose as in Dance the stately Trees (vii. 323–4).

There may be two such pauses in a line:

> but torture without end
> Still urges, and a fiery Deluge, fed (i. 67–68).

Other points to note are that punctuation at the end of the line or half-line intensifies the fixed stress, according to the degree of punctuation and length of pause; and that punctuation gives stress to an adjacent accented syllable, whether it comes before or after the punctuation:

> What matter where, if I be still the same,
> And what I should be, all but less then he
> Whom Thunder hath made greater? Here at least
> We shall be free; (i. 256–9).

Milton's punctuation, like his spelling, was of his own time, but this too he adjusts to the prosody. Seventeenth-century punctuation was more rhetorical than any subsequent punctuation, which until recently aimed progressively at being entirely grammatical. Milton's pointing of course has its grammatical as well as its rhetorical functions: the question is how the one is adapted to the other. Miss Darbishire has clearly distinguished and illustrated the grammatical functions, but says nothing of the more important prosodical functions. I shall illustrate the point from Milton's use of the comma. The comma, as all the points, is used sparingly. As Miss Darbishire says, it is not used before vocatives, or with phrases in apposition, and often not with subordinate clauses and qualifying phrases; but she does not remark that Milton often allows the fixed pauses at the end of the line and half-line to do the work of a comma:

> Not that faire field

> Of *Enna*, where *Proserpin* gathring flowrs
> Her self a fairer Flowre by gloomie *Dis*
> Was gatherd, (iv. 268–71).

The overriding principle of his punctuation is that it must never counter or interfere with the pauses, stresses, and rhythm of the verse; the prosody must be left free to do its work.

The pointing of *Paradise Regain'd* and *Samson Agonistes* is, as Miss Darbishire says, both lighter and more casual than that of *Paradise Lost*, and she rightly breaks up some of the long passages by introducing an occasional heavier stop; the simpler structure of the language and prosody of the *Miscellaneous Poems* also requires a less elaborate pointing.

To come now to the spelling devices, and first to Milton's use of the apostrophe. Miss Darbishire states as her first rule for the apostrophe that it is used to indicate the vowel sound before *l* and *n*; but this is not borne out by Milton's text. As she points out, 'he does not use the apostrophe after syllabic *l* before final *s*, though he uses it deliberately before final *'d*: thus *principl'd*, *fabl'd*, *manacl'd*, but *principles*, *myrtles*'. The fact is, I think, that Milton spells *fabl'd* because *fabled* would suggest a false pronunciation. As to syllabic *n*, the spelling with apostrophe, as Miss Darbishire notes, is comparatively infrequent in *Paradise Lost*; and that is because it is used only when the syllable is elided. Thus, *open* occurs nineteen times, *op'n* only four; *golden* 28, *gold'n* twice. Miss Darbishire prints *op'n* and *gold'n* consistently, in accordance with her supposed rule; but if it had been a rule of Milton's he would have succeeded in getting it better observed, as he succeeded in other such points. In any case the only ground for formulating such a rule would be that Milton's text has followed it. The evidence on which Miss Darbishire relies is that in the manuscript *forbidden* is corrected to *forbidd'n* (i. 2), and *open* to *op'n* (i. 662), though both editions restore *forbidden* and *open*. In the first of these lines *forbidden* is not elidible:

> Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast;

in the other *open* could be elided but is not:

> Open or understood must be resolv'd.

Miss Darbishire next confuses syllabic *n* with *-en* and *-on* after *v* and the *z* sound. The latter, as we have seen, are contractions but she regards them as elisions; and further confuses the issue by quoting *garden* and *burden*, which are true examples of syllabic *n*, along with *heav'n*, *chos'n*, *pris'n*, &c.

For some reason she next mentions the elision of *the* before a vowel as a special case. Here she dives deeper and comes up muddier:

> The general principle followed would appear to be: elide before an unstressed syllable and spell *th'*; spell *the* before a stressed syllable and do not elide. . . . But there are exceptions. *The Angel* occurs consistently up to the middle of Book XI; after that *th'Angel* occurs six times. *The other* and *th'other* are alternatives all through . . . *th'earth*, representing one metrical syllable, occurs a few times, *th'air* only twice.

This is all very puzzling. The simple fact is that *the* is an example of permissive elision, the apostrophe being used when elision occurs. It is a question only of attending to the prosody. The exceptions she cites to her 'general principle' are exceptions only to her incorrect rule of elision. It is certainly not a rule of Milton's elision not to elide an unstressed before a stressed syllable: why should it be? The exceptions to her rule outnumber the positive examples of it. To take a few rarer words, to save much counting: *the Ocean* occurs five times, *th'Ocean* twice; *the utmost* thrice, *th'utmost* twice; *the ancient* twice, *th'ancient* once; *the image* thrice, *th'image* once; *the herb* once, *th'herb* once; *the only* nine times, *th'only* once.

Miss Darbishire's three rules may be reduced to one: the apostrophe is used to indicate elision or, in certain words, contraction. Since it is an unambiguous as well as a useful rule it could be applied to all the poems.

Miss Darbishire has pointed out, and I do not remember that this rule has been defined before, or at any rate so exactly, that the *-ed* suffix of the preterite and past participle of weak verbs is only spelt so when pronounced; when contracted the *e* is omitted, with or without an apostrophe:

> Her *unadorned* golden tresses wore
> *Dissheveld*, but in wanton ringlets *wav'd*. (iv. 305–6)

The apostrophe, as Miss Darbishire says, is used only if needed to show, as *e* of the present tense would, that the preceding vowel is long or that a preceding *c* or *g* is soft; so, *dissheveld* but *wav'd*; and *destind* but *declin'd*, *robd* but *rob'd*, *wingd* but *plung'd*, *seduc'd*. The same rule applies to the *t* suffix: *linkt* but *invok't*, *advanc't*. It can further be observed (although the text is not consistent here) that the apostrophe is not needed to show that a preceding vowel is long if the spelling already does so (*maimd*, *feignd*, *flowd*, *pourd*, *foild*), except when a digraph is of ambiguous length, as is the case with *ea* (so, *learnd* but *fear'd*, *appear'd*). Words ending in *-se* and *-ve* are, however, spelt with apostrophe, perhaps, as Miss Darbishire says, because the omitted *e* is regarded as belonging to the stem of the word rather than to the suffix.

In connexion with this last rule for the apostrophe may be taken a rule of spelling for distinguishing, when possible, the preterite of weak verbs from the participle; I do not know that this has ever before been exactly stated either. Miss Darbishire defines the rule in these words: 'After unvoiced consonants the final *d* or *t* of the preterite and past participle of weak verbs are used distinctly as follows: the preterite is spelt with final *d*, the past participle with final *t*.' This distinction is well observed in *Paradise Lost*. As Miss Darbishire says, 'Milton's intricate sentence with its network of Anglo-Latin participles needs all the help that spelling can give to distinguish verbal forms', and the usefulness of this rule is well illustrated by the following passage:

> So spake, so *wishd* much humbl'd *Eve*, but Fate
> Subscrib'd not; Nature first gave Signs, *imprest*
> On Bird, Beast, Aire, Aire suddenly *eclipsd*
> After short blush of Morn; nigh in her sight
> The Bird of *Jove*, *stoopt* from his aerie tour,
> Two Birds of gayest plume before him drove: (xi. 181–6).

This distinction is not properly established in the earlier poems but since it is unambiguous it might be followed there also.

I pass over some minor rules of spelling Miss Darbishire illuminates to come to the most interesting of all these devices, those used to indicate prosodic stress. The best known are what are called the emphatic and unemphatic forms of the personal pronouns; the emphatic forms being *hee*, *mee*, *wee*, *yee*, *you*, *their*, the unemphatic *he*, *me*, *we*, *ye*, *thir*. Although the general purpose of these has been recognized at least since Jonathan Richardson remarked on them, Milton's exact use of them seems never to have been discerned. It is supposed that their use is determined only by the sense, and that the emphatic form should be used whenever one of these pronouns is stressed. It is too simple a view and does not accord with the facts; and it forces Miss Darbishire to emend her copy text so liberally that one wonders how she can continue to believe that this explains the phenomena or that indeed there is any system in Milton's use of these forms at all. An examination of these spellings, however, in the second edition, admittedly the more accurate in this respect, shows that their use is controlled by prosodical considerations and that the emphatic forms are used only when the stress is not indicated by other means. Like all these devices they are used economically. The prosody of *Paradise Lost* provides, as we have seen, for four main differences in emphasis: the unaccented, the accented, the stressed, and (with the aid of punctuation) the strongly stressed. The unemphatic forms are used not only for the first two but also for a pronoun already stressed, or even one strongly stressed, by position: a stressed pronoun may therefore have the unemphatic spelling. The emphatic forms are reserved for showing stress on a pronoun that is not stressed by position or for showing strong stress on one that is. The emphatic forms are also used for the different purpose of preventing elision: theoretically therefore an unstressed pronoun may have the emphatic spelling.

The niceties of these uses can be illustrated from anywhere in the second edition. I shall start with the fixed stresses. The end of a line closed by a stop does not need the emphatic spelling even for strong stress:

> That I should mind thee oft, and mind thou me. (ix. 358)

me *Edd. 1, 2*] mee *Darbishire*. *mee* is excessive, turning Adam's gravely affectionate words to petulant rebuke; Milton keeps such overstressing for the histrionic Satan:

> look on mee,
> Mee who have toucht and tasted, (ix. 687–8).

There is one example of emphatic spelling at the end of a closed line that is to be explained differently:

> Neither had I transgrest, nor thou with mee. (ix. 1161)

The normal speech stress is on *with*, which would result in a slighting of *me*; the emphatic spelling is therefore needed to secure the stress on *mee* and to prevent what would otherwise be a bad line. For ordinary stress at the end of a line the emphatic spelling is not needed even when the line runs over:

And what I should be, all but less than he
Whom Thunder hath made greater? (i. 257–8)

he *MS., Ed. 2*] hee *Ed. 1, D.* The emphatic spelling is, however, needed for strong stress when a line runs over, as it is not when closed:

and most likelie if from mee
Thou sever not. (ix. 365–6)

Compare the first example (ix. 358), where *me* is not less heavily stressed than *mee* here. The emphatic spelling also is always needed at the end of a run-over line when the first syllable of the following line is stressed; this is to ensure the necessary pause between two successive stresses:

Eternal Father (For where is not hee
Present) . . . (vii. 517–18)

Similarly a pronoun at the end of the half-line, if punctuated, does not need the emphatic spelling:

If thou beest he: But O how fall'n! how chang'd (i. 84)

he *MS., Ed. 1, 2*] hee *Capel Lofft, D. hee* is excessive and Milton again reserves such overstressing for Satan in vaunting mood:

Know ye not then said *Satan*, filld with scorn,
Know ye not mee? ye knew me once no mate (iv. 827–8).

When, however, the half-line is punctuated only by a comma the emphatic spelling is used for strong stress, as it is not at the end of the line:

What thinkst thou then of mee, and this my State, (viii. 403).

Even when the medial pause is unpunctuated the emphatic spelling is only used if it might be overrun:

Though not as shee with Bow and Quiver armd (ix. 390).

But for the emphatic *shee* the reader might run on to *Bow* for the medial pause; the spelling serves the same purpose as a comma.

A stop, as we have seen, especially a heavy stop, always gives stress to a following word in an accented position, and there is no need for the emphatic spelling:

Th'infernal Serpent: he it was, whose guile (i. 34)

he *Edd. 1, 2*) hee *MS., D.* Otherwise the emphatic spellings are always needed to show stress at the accented as distinct from the stressed positions. Here are examples for all four of these positions:

Was shee thy God, that her thou didst obey (x. 145)

Nor less think wee in Heav'n of thee on Earth (viii. 224)

(The medial pause is after *Heav'n.*)

Fruit of thy Womb: On mee the Curse aslope (x. 1053)

Can fit his punishment, or their revenge. (x. 242)

A stress in the eighth position results in some slighting of the end stress when the line runs over; a stressed pronoun is therefore never used in this position in an unclosed line if the end of the line is to take its full stress:

What in me is dark
Illumin, (i. 22–23)

me *MS., Edd. 1, 2*] mee *C.L., D.* The full stress is on ***dark***, and ***me*** gets its due by accentuation. In the same way Miss Darbishire sometimes interferes with the medial stress:

and howle and gnaw
My Bowels, thir repast; . . . (ii. 799–800)

thir *Ed. 2*] their *Ed. 1, D.* Miss Darbishire says, 'Milton means "***their*** repast" in antithesis to "My Bowels" '; but the verse stresses are on ***Bowels*** and ***repast***, as the initial capital apart from good sense tells, not on *My* and ***thir***. Miss Darbishire substitutes emphatic spellings at other points in the line where accent gives the due emphasis:

Ye Hills and Dales, ye Rivers, Woods, and Plaines,
And ye that live and move, fair Creatures, tell, (viii. 275–6)

ye . . . ye . . . ye *Edd. 1, 2*] ye . . . ye . . . yee *D.* The third ***ye*** is sufficiently differentiated from the others by being accented; ***yee*** breaks the run of the second line, and alters the sense by turning a defining clause that is part of the subject into a parenthetical clause offering further information.

The emphatic spelling is of course always used for a stressed pronoun in an unaccented position:

Shee gave me of the Tree, and I did eate. (x. 143)

Each in their kinde. The Earth obeyd, and strait (vii. 453)

Most Favors, who can please him long? Mee first
He ruind, now Mankind; (ix. 949–50).

Lastly it is remarkable how often the emphatic spellings serve to prevent elision. This is a different function, which may leave it doubtful whether more stress is intended than is involved in a hiatus. To take the unaccented positions first. In the following example ***hee*** is obviously stressed, producing reversal of the accent:

Two other Precious drops that ready stood,
Each in thir Crystal sluce, hee ere they fell
Kissd . . . (v. 132–4)

But in the following it is doubtful whether ***hee*** indicates more than an avoidance of elision:

Whereat hee inlie rag'd, and as they talkd, (xi. 444).

It is natural to read this line with the accent in its regular position on the first syllable of ***inlie***. There can be similar doubt in the accented positions. By the rules already exemplified, unemphatic spellings might have been used in the following verses but for the need to indicate that there is no elision:

Thee lastly nuptial Bowr, by mee adornd (xi. 280)

To Person or to Poem. Mee of these
Nor skilld nor studious, (ix. 41–42).

Once Milton's use of the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns has been understood an editor finds very few places indeed in the second edition of *Paradise Lost* where he need even consider emending; they constitute the clearest evidence of the control exercised by the poet over the minutiae of the text. Miss Darbishire like others is altogether too liberal with her emending emphatic forms. These emphatic forms appear in *Paradise Regain'd*, *Samson Agonistes*, and the later *Sonnets*, though less regularly; there are some places where one can safely put an emphatic for an unemphatic spelling, but not many, and Miss Darbishire has again been too generous. They are not used in the earlier poems, and there is no question of an editor attempting to supply them.

Milton has emphatic and unemphatic forms for many other words than the personal pronouns; *bin* for instance is his normal spelling of *been*, and *agen* of *again*, the latter being kept for the few occasions when these words are stressed. But for the most part these other emphatic and unemphatic spellings are formed either by the omission of final *e* to make the unemphatic spelling (*don*, *ow*, *som*) or by the addition of final *e* to make the emphatic spelling (*milde*, *minde*, *feare*, *gulfe*, *doe* (also *doo*), *obtaine*, *transferre*, and countless more). Editors have not known what to make of these spellings with and without final *e*, but the rules are the same as for the pronouns. It is not to be expected that rules so nice should be applied quite so accurately to a large and miscellaneous lot of words as to the small compact group of the personal pronouns, but there are not in fact many errors apart from unnecessary emphatic spellings at the accented and, more culpably, at the fixed stress positions. *Dawn* and *dawne*, for instance, are used correctly throughout *Paradise Lost*; so are *dear* and *deare*, except that *deare* is sometimes used superfluously at the end of a closed line; *frail* is correctly so spelt except for the one occasion when the emphatic form is needed:

> Fraile is our happiness, if this be so, (ix. 340).

All the uses of the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns, which I have illustrated, could be illustrated over again from this large and miscellaneous lot of words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns), confirming my interpretation of those forms; but I will content myself with one particularly nice example from Book II:

> Into this *wilde* Abyss,
> The Womb of Nature and perhaps her Grave,
> . . . . . .
> Into this *wild* Abyss the warie Fiend (ii. 910–17).

When the poet resumes his sentence after a parenthesis of six lines he naturally does not repeat the stress on 'wild'; this is a correction in the second edition, the first edition, followed by Miss Darbishire, giving *wilde* at both places. It is one of the many minute corrections that show how carefully the text was revised for the second edition.

Valuable as this edition is and will remain, I cannot help thinking that Miss Darbishire would have got nearer her mark of a reformed text, 'brought as near as possible to that which Milton intended', had she taken the second edition for her basic text, and had she paid more attention to Milton's prosody and less to those spellings he shows himself indifferent to. B. A. WRIGHT

The Letters of Daniel Defoe. Edited by GEORGE HARRIS HEALEY. Pp. xxii+506. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 42*s*. net.

The extraordinary pace of Defoe's quill, as it travelled over paper, becomes the more impressive when we reflect that not till he was near thirty did he make his appearance as an author. The first of his surviving letters (it lies in the Public Record Office) was written when he was over forty, and yet we have here, coming down to us in one form or another, letters sufficient in number to fill out a substantially thick volume. He could turn off a memorandum addressed to Robert Harley, running to twenty closely printed pages, offering advice upon the form of government best suited to this country, followed by relevant commentary upon European affairs, without the slightest interruption to the business or literary engagements with which he was otherwise occupied. Although in the everyday pursuits of life Defoe cannot be numbered with the successful—involved as he was in debts, struggling with creditors, confined within prison walls—courage and the capacity for work never failed him. Even from jail he continued to conduct pamphlet and periodical writing. He was the first of our social historians. His disquisitions, his advice to Ministers, are sound in outlook. It is this side of his life that we see in his letters. As a writer of fiction he appears not at all.

Our conclusions upon Defoe as a man, our estimate of his gifts as a social and economic commentator, have been mainly drawn from his many pamphlets, his *Review*, and his contributions to other periodicals. Our impression of his integrity and straightforwardness suffers. He could write either in the Whig or Tory interest for his own needs and that of his family as occasion demanded. Frequently he must have found it difficult to reconcile tergiversations with his conscience. In his letters we come nearer to him, and we can judge more closely the man himself. If, in approaching those in power, he could drop into whining cant, he appears, nevertheless, a genuine lover of honest dealing, of toleration and liberty. His judgement upon the public affairs of this and other countries is remarkably straightforward and discerning. Clearness of sight Daniel Defoe, the first outstanding hack-journalist, certainly possessed.

Professor Healey's volume meets a long-felt need—a collection of all Defoe's letters within the same covers. These are not many, those written by Defoe himself numbering only 235, and those written to him 16. Most have already appeared in print, the major accumulation in the Historical Manuscripts Commission's report on the papers of the Duke of Portland. Mr. Healey claims no more than four letters written by Defoe himself as hitherto unprinted. Few of his letters, however, wherever printed, have received any annotation.

As compared with other letter-writers belonging to the earlier half of the eighteenth century, Addison, Swift, Pope, for example, the number of Defoe's surviving letters is small. *They* belonged to a higher level of society. The members of Defoe's immediate circle would not be likely to prize letters when once read; and if occasionally preserved they would disappear upon the owner's death. Nearly 200 of the letters here printed were addressed to one person, whom for years Defoe served as a secret agent, Robert Harley, later Earl of Oxford. As

Once Milton's use of the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns has been understood an editor finds very few places indeed in the second edition of *Paradise Lost* where he need even consider emending; they constitute the clearest evidence of the control exercised by the poet over the minutiae of the text. Miss Darbishire like others is altogether too liberal with her emending emphatic forms. These emphatic forms appear in *Paradise Regain'd*, *Samson Agonistes*, and the later *Sonnets*, though less regularly; there are some places where one can safely put an emphatic for an unemphatic spelling, but not many, and Miss Darbishire has again been too generous. They are not used in the earlier poems, and there is no question of an editor attempting to supply them.

Milton has emphatic and unemphatic forms for many other words than the personal pronouns; *bin* for instance is his normal spelling of *been*, and *agen* of *again*, the latter being kept for the few occasions when these words are stressed. But for the most part these other emphatic and unemphatic spellings are formed either by the omission of final *e* to make the unemphatic spelling (*don*, *ow*, *som*) or by the addition of final *e* to make the emphatic spelling (*milde*, *minde*, *feare*, *gulfe*, *doe* (also *doo*), *obtaine*, *transferre*, and countless more). Editors have not known what to make of these spellings with and without final *e*, but the rules are the same as for the pronouns. It is not to be expected that rules so nice should be applied quite so accurately to a large and miscellaneous lot of words as to the small compact group of the personal pronouns, but there are not in fact many errors apart from unnecessary emphatic spellings at the accented and, more culpably, at the fixed stress positions. *Dawn* and *dawne*, for instance, are used correctly throughout *Paradise Lost*; so are *dear* and *deare*, except that *deare* is sometimes used superfluously at the end of a closed line; *frail* is correctly so spelt except for the one occasion when the emphatic form is needed:

> Fraile is our happiness, if this be so, (ix. 340).

All the uses of the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns, which I have illustrated, could be illustrated over again from this large and miscellaneous lot of words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns), confirming my interpretation of those forms; but I will content myself with one particularly nice example from Book II:

> Into this *wilde* Abyss,
> The Womb of Nature and perhaps her Grave,
> . . . . . .
> Into this *wild* Abyss the warie Fiend (ii. 910–17).

When the poet resumes his sentence after a parenthesis of six lines he naturally does not repeat the stress on 'wild'; this is a correction in the second edition, the first edition, followed by Miss Darbishire, giving *wilde* at both places. It is one of the many minute corrections that show how carefully the text was revised for the second edition.

Valuable as this edition is and will remain, I cannot help thinking that Miss Darbishire would have got nearer her mark of a reformed text, 'brought as near as possible to that which Milton intended', had she taken the second edition for her basic text, and had she paid more attention to Milton's prosody and less to those spellings he shows himself indifferent to. B. A. WRIGHT

The Letters of Daniel Defoe. Edited by GEORGE HARRIS HEALEY. Pp. xxii+ 506. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 42*s.* net.

The extraordinary pace of Defoe's quill, as it travelled over paper, becomes the more impressive when we reflect that not till he was near thirty did he make his appearance as an author. The first of his surviving letters (it lies in the Public Record Office) was written when he was over forty, and yet we have here, coming down to us in one form or another, letters sufficient in number to fill out a substantially thick volume. He could turn off a memorandum addressed to Robert Harley, running to twenty closely printed pages, offering advice upon the form of government best suited to this country, followed by relevant commentary upon European affairs, without the slightest interruption to the business or literary engagements with which he was otherwise occupied. Although in the everyday pursuits of life Defoe cannot be numbered with the successful—involved as he was in debts, struggling with creditors, confined within prison walls—courage and the capacity for work never failed him. Even from jail he continued to conduct pamphlet and periodical writing. He was the first of our social historians. His disquisitions, his advice to Ministers, are sound in outlook. It is this side of his life that we see in his letters. As a writer of fiction he appears not at all.

Our conclusions upon Defoe as a man, our estimate of his gifts as a social and economic commentator, have been mainly drawn from his many pamphlets, his *Review*, and his contributions to other periodicals. Our impression of his integrity and straightforwardness suffers. He could write either in the Whig or Tory interest for his own needs and that of his family as occasion demanded. Frequently he must have found it difficult to reconcile tergiversations with his conscience. In his letters we come nearer to him, and we can judge more closely the man himself. If, in approaching those in power, he could drop into whining cant, he appears, nevertheless, a genuine lover of honest dealing, of toleration and liberty. His judgement upon the public affairs of this and other countries is remarkably straightforward and discerning. Clearness of sight Daniel Defoe, the first outstanding hack-journalist, certainly possessed.

Professor Healey's volume meets a long-felt need—a collection of all Defoe's letters within the same covers. These are not many, those written by Defoe himself numbering only 235, and those written to him 16. Most have already appeared in print, the major accumulation in the Historical Manuscripts Commission's report on the papers of the Duke of Portland. Mr. Healey claims no more than four letters written by Defoe himself as hitherto unprinted. Few of his letters, however, wherever printed, have received any annotation.

As compared with other letter-writers belonging to the earlier half of the eighteenth century, Addison, Swift, Pope, for example, the number of Defoe's surviving letters is small. *They* belonged to a higher level of society. The members of Defoe's immediate circle would not be likely to prize letters when once read; and if occasionally preserved they would disappear upon the owner's death. Nearly 200 of the letters here printed were addressed to one person, whom for years Defoe served as a secret agent, Robert Harley, later Earl of Oxford. As

against these we have only one undoubted letter from Harley to Defoe, an unsigned copy in Harley's hand, and, in addition, a paper of instructions, presumably from Harley to Defoe. There are three letters to Lord Halifax, three to Godolphin, two to the Earl of Sunderland, and one to Lord Wharton. Considering the years during which Defoe was occupied in serving Whig or Tory magnates this residue is singularly small. Very likely it was thought safer to destroy his communications rather than to retain them.

By far the most interesting and historically valuable range of letters belongs to the years 1706–7, covering Defoe's long sojourn in Scotland during which he kept Harley informed of the course of events leading to the Parliamentary Union of England and Scotland. If his status at this time as a secret agent of the English government had been realized his life would have been in danger. He might have been torn to pieces by the Edinburgh mob. As it was, his adroitness in introducing himself to all sections of the community, including even the most violent ministers of the Scottish Kirk, must command our admiration. Throughout, Defoe showed acumen and foresight in adapting himself to the ebb and flow of events. At one time he finds the Scots a 'Sober, Religious & Gallant Nation' who in unison with the English would make 'us all one great people'. At another he finds them 'fermented and Implacable'. Writing to Harley, after the accomplishment of the Union, he observed that 'The Nobility of Scotland My Lord are an Odd kind of People, to say no more of them'. Their degree of usefulness, from an English point of view, he finds in the 'posture' they happen to stand in 'with respect to the kirk'.

The letters gathered in Mr. Healey's volume are a notable contribution to a better understanding of Defoe as a man and as a percipient commentator upon that important period of English history—the reign of Queen Anne. The few letters of later years, 1717–30, which Mr. Healey has been able to print, are widely scattered in date and of less importance. The preservation of the letters from 1703 to 1714 we owe to the good fortune that most of them were addressed to Robert Harley, a born collector. These have long been in print, but not in the accurate text in which now we can read them. Furthermore, many of the letters were undated, and some dates previously assigned demonstrably wrong. Mr. Healey has been at pains to correct conjectural and misleading dates, thus serving a better chronological sequence. In his annotation he has encountered a difficult task in identifying, in many instances, Defoe's ambiguous allusions to men and events. His footnotes deserve warm commendation. They are concise, thorough, judicious, and exegetical. HAROLD WILLIAMS

Laureate of Peace. On the Genius of Alexander Pope. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Pp. viii+187. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954. 21s. net.

Mr. Wilson Knight seeks to demonstrate the 'total significance' of Pope's poetry, as he has already sought to do for the poetry of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's idiom, however, comprises symbols which are common to many writers of his age, and so is susceptible of a total interpretation in objective terms. Hence, whether one accepts a particular interpretation or not, one is prepared

to agree provisionally that such an interpretation is possible, and that it may be helpful in understanding the plays. Pope, writing in a more abstract idiom, uses no such symbols; he has only certain concepts and preoccupations which are consistent throughout his work, and can be recognized by all who read his poetry seriously. He does not lend himself easily to the kind of interpretation that Mr. Wilson Knight wishes to achieve, and one wonders whether such an interpretation is indeed desirable in his case. Is it, for instance, helpful to be told that in *The Rape of the Lock* Pope makes 'a synthesis of the Christianity-Eros conflict'? From Mr. Wilson Knight's point of view it is, since his thesis rests on the assumption that the total significance of Pope's poetry may be found in his preoccupation with the concepts of 'harmony' and 'peace'. But, even if one is prepared to tolerate the fashionable psychological jargon, is this the kind of criticism that illuminates the poetry; or does it rather suggest an *a priori* assumption imposed on an example where it can neither be proved nor disproved? The pleasure of *The Rape of the Lock* lies in the balance which the poet holds between what is trivial and what is grave so exquisitely that the two are inseparable: this is the essence of great ironical writing. But when this balance becomes a resolution of 'the Christianity-Eros conflict' (terms which would have been either nonsensical or blasphemous for Pope) the effect is to sacrifice the identity of the poet for the sake of some sort of world-view of poetry. In fact, unless one accepts from the outset the desirability of discovering a total significance for his poetry one is likely to emerge from Mr. Wilson Knight's book little the wiser about Pope.

Mr. Wilson Knight is aware of this difficulty; but although he admits that 'the first reaction' to his approach 'is likely to be one of incredulity or even annoyance' he does little to dispel either. His method is that of assertion rather than argument, and the effect of his first chapter is that of a series of brilliantly conceived 'examination quotes' after each of which the reader feels compelled to add the mental parenthesis, 'Discuss'. Unfortunately discuss is what Mr. Wilson Knight rarely does. 'We may recall', he says, '. . . the great powers of classical myth exerted on the Augustans.' But he gives no indication of the nature of the powers mentioned in this portentous statement, nor of the way in which they were exerted. He is continually urging the reader to 'remember' matters which, if he is tolerably well informed, he may recall in a light very different from that which Mr. Wilson Knight requires, or, if he is not, he may accept on insufficient evidence. For example: 'We must not forget for one instant that this is the Temple of Fame, and that she is *exactly what her name implies*.' Of course Mr. Wilson Knight knows that the significance of 'Fame' as a literary personification lies in the fundamental ambiguity of the word, and perhaps he assumes the same knowledge in his readers. Nevertheless, italics are a dangerous substitute for analysis, and the uninstructed, overawed by so much emphasis, may be led to imagine a clarity which does not exist.

Therein lies the danger of a book of this kind. For those who can make their own reservations Mr. Wilson Knight has many stimulating things to say about Pope. Others, seeking a line of approach, may accept as definitive an interpretation which is only partial.

NORMAN CALLAN

Diderot and Sterne. By ALICE GREEN FREDMAN. Pp. xii+264. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. 36*s.* net.

Diderot mockingly acknowledged that he had copied two paragraphs of *Tristram Shandy* for his *Jacques le Fataliste*. This avowal of plagiarism, while making evident the connexion between Diderot and Sterne, has diverted critical attention from the essential aspect of their relationship. The question is not how much *Tristram* there is in *Jacques*, but what it was that Diderot found congenial in Sterne. Such is the starting-point of Dr. Fredman's book. To get farther away from the misleading consideration of Sterne's influence on Diderot, the author seeks to re-examine their connexion as it stands out against the background of contemporary trends and ideas. She proceeds to assess their similarities and divergences under four main heads: their treatments of sensibility and humour, their fictional theories and practices, and their styles.

The obvious difficulties of such an undertaking are increased by the elusive character of the two writers, and Dr. Fredman's methodical and patient research deserves to be commended. Her knowledge of the period extends to minute details, though it seems that she is more at ease when she writes of Diderot, while one suspects that her mind is not quite made up about Sterne. Dr. Fredman's competent and perceptive analyses make it clear, however, that such shortcomings as the book evinces should be ascribed to the very nature of its method.

There are similarities between Diderot and Sterne; both of them were bold experimenters; both consciously rejected the fictional practices of their times; both were interested in 'those minutiae of thought and feeling which . . . have an importance for the moment'; and both, Dr. Fredman concludes, assume their greatest historical significance as transitional figures. But these common traits weigh little compared with their differences. And once the question of influence and plagiarism has been discarded, there remains only a narrow basis for a sustained comparison of the two writers.

Such a confrontation would be fully justified if it added a dimension to our understanding of the two writers, set up as foils to each other. But our expectation is disappointed in this respect; through its own exigencies, the comparison seems rather to have hampered the author in her appreciation of Sterne. Most of the time, however, it is Dr. Fredman's merit to make us forget that we are treading on thin ice. In the chapter on 'Humour' the author is not so successful:

> There are grounds, however, for comparing Diderot and Sterne as humorists, for both men possessed a sense of humor, they appreciated that trait in others, and they utilized humor in their writings. (p. 55)

Diderot can justly be said to have *utilized* humour in his novels, seizing 'every opportunity to draw a moral, to make his lesson very clear' (p. 78). But it is equally obvious that humour in *Tristram Shandy* was not subordinated to any moralizing intention. To infer from that comparison, as Dr. Fredman does, that Sterne lacked 'moral seriousness' appears as an example of the dangers attached to analysing two essentially different writers with the same set of critical instruments. Dr. Fredman's avowed design in this chapter is to prove that 'there is no basis for arguing that Diderot unsuccessfully tried to ape Sterne' (p. 83), and

that is all to the good. But this laudable intention becomes a bias when Dr. Fredman deplores as an 'oversight' that Sterne 'did not endeavor to develop a theory of satire equal to Diderot's' (p. 51). As Dr. Fredman is aware that Sterne was 'perhaps more directly concerned with practice than with putting intellectual ideas into practice' (p. 168), it is surprising to find that she equates Sterne's lack of theorizing to a lack of seriousness and 'profundity'. The reason given for this shortcoming of Sterne's is even more surprising:

> If [Sterne's] treatment of humor lacks Diderot's more serious overtones, it is because Sterne's aim is to entertain everyone. (p. 77) . . . Now it is no easy matter to please everyone all the time—Sterne finally had to admit it himself. . . . a more serious man might hesitate to modify his stand in the interests of mass appeal. (p. 76)

The very words 'mass appeal', applied to an eighteenth-century audience, do not seem particularly apt.

Sterne could not moralize seriously, for fear of 'losing his public'. A slave to the reader's taste, he 'viewed practically everything he wrote in terms of remuneration' (p. 166). Diderot, who wrote for his friend, was attracted to fiction 'for philosophic and aesthetic purposes' (p. 89), whereas Sterne's 'obvious and uncomplicated' motives were wealth and social prestige. Though no very important matter, the idea occurs often enough in the book to deserve discussion. Perhaps Dr. Fredman is right in taking Sterne's notorious boast, 'I write not to be *fed*, but to be famous', with unmitigated seriousness. But Sterne's motives do not appear so uncomplicated when one considers the many instances in which he presents his work as a way of relieving his urgent sense of mortality.

But Dr. Fredman is not attuned to the more tragic overtones of *Tristram Shandy*; she finds that 'mutability, generally unfamiliar to *Tristram* except as a source of laughter, is the dominant note' in *A Sentimental Journey* (p. 194). How then does she account for the narrator's apostrophe to Janatone (VII. 9), or to Jenny (IX. 8), and for the many passages which are illustrations of man's pitiful subjection to change?

Dr. Fredman thinks that 'Sterne never provides any evidence that he faces a struggle with language' (p. 192); one will agree with her that Sterne 'felt no pressure on him to use a ponderous style'. But surely he was acutely conscious of the problem of communication; that he was intellectually aware of it appears in the narrator's wish at the end of Book IV in *Tristram Shandy*: ' . . . if I can so manage [this part of my work] as to convey but the same impressions to every other brain, which the occurrences themselves excite in my own— . . .' (IV. 32).

These differences notwithstanding, *Diderot and Sterne* remains a thorough re-evaluation of a controverted relationship. Dr. Fredman's style is generally pleasant; and yet, in Sterne's own words, she sometimes darkens her 'hypothesis by placing a number of tall, opaque words, one before another'. The book is excellently printed; among a few trivial misprints, notes 42 and 43 on p. 236 should refer to Book II, not Book I. There is no mention in the bibliography of Mr. H. W. Streeter's useful background study, *The Eighteenth Century English Novel in French Translation* (New York, 1936).

J. C. SALLÉ

Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann. Edited by W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith, and George L. Lam. Vol. I, pp. lxviii+506; Vol. II, pp. viii+567; Vol. III, pp. viii+511 (The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence 17–19). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. £12 net.

The present three volumes form the first of three instalments of the Mann correspondence. It takes us as far as the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748. The second instalment will end in 1767 and the third in 1786. We shall of course have to wait for the mighty index to guide us about this vast amount of matter. Meanwhile we cannot do better than quote the opening paragraph of Mr. Lewis's introduction:

> We now come to the great Andean range of the Walpolian continent. The correspondence with the elder Horace Mann extends from Walpole's twenty-third year to his sixty-ninth, from 1740 to 1786, from the Age of Pope to the appearance of the Kilmarnock Burns. For sweep and variety of great events it is unrivalled among Walpole's correspondences: the reader who goes through it from beginning to end will acquire, we suggest, a fuller picture of the period than he can get from any other writer in it. And if these letters had been his only ones to survive, Walpole's place as a letter-writer would be just what it is.

Mann's letters to Walpole are now printed in full for the first time. There are 887 of them. As with the other correspondents, Mann cannot rival his friend either in wit or style. Unkind things have been said of them, yet the selection made by Dr. Doran in 1876 with the facetious title '*Mann' and Manners at the Court of Florence, 1740–1786* has long been a pleasant and valuable companion to students of eighteenth-century Italy, and such will welcome the full text, arid and trivial though it may be in places. Walpole's letters still deserve Macaulay's praise.

When the correspondence opens, Walpole is in Rome, and Gray is with him still, and later there are some hints of the famous quarrel. But the Prime Minister's son and the not very important diplomat are preoccupied with keeping watch on the exiled Stewarts, and wrap the matters up in an air of mystery and self-importance which may not have impressed the government at home quite so much. After Walpole's return to England, the two Horaces never met again but continued to inform and entertain one another for all those years with unflagging friendship and zest. Personal gossip bulks large. Walpole continued to be interested in his old Florentine friends and, possibly, flames. There was also the continuous procession of English travellers whose entertainment and guidance became Mann's chief duty. His house, the Palazzo Manetti, illustrated here, became known as *The British Arms*! Then there were always Lady Orford and Lady Pomfret to scandalize. Those who have known Florence, that paradise of eccentric exiles in these later years, will derive amusement from this aspect of the continuity of history.

An admirable account of Sir Horace Mann, fuller than anything previously done, precedes the usual elaborate commentary. It is probably the most instructive of the series so far. It is very informative on Italian topics, such as social

habits, methods of timekeeping then in vogue, and currency. The notes are also inevitably less prim than in earlier volumes. Mann could be very free in Italian, and must be explained. The explanations are sometimes ingenuous and it may be doubted whether the editors are right in connecting 'bugio', &c. (words for lying and liars chiefly, and not obsolete anyhow) with less reputable words beginning with the same three letters.

It is indeed an Andean range and the editorial travellers have still alps beyond those alps to surmount. We in the plain shall eagerly await their return with further trophies.

D. M. Low

Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century. Edited by ROBERTA FLORENCE BRINKLEY. Pp. xxxviii+704. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. £4. 14s. net.

The length of this book, if all new writing, might well appal; but it is, in fact, a valuable and original compilation of what Coleridge said about the Seventeenth Century and its writers (excluding Shakespeare). It will be indispensable for future study of Coleridge's thought. Miss Brinkley arranges her material in seven sections of very different length, to most of which she prefixes her own introductions. The sections, with the number of pages they occupy, are as follows: (1) The Seventeenth Century (i.e. historical), 34. (2) Philosophy, 83 (Locke at greatest length). (3) The Old Divines, 266 (Donne, Jeremy Taylor, Baxter at greatest length). (4) Science, 16. (5) Literary Prose, 90. (6) Poetry, 132 (Milton at greatest length). (7) Drama, 46. There is a short appendix on 'Reason and Understanding'.

The material is drawn both from printed books and periodicals and from manuscripts, the latter including *marginalia*, previously published but now retranscribed, often in a more correct or complete form. Excerpts are also used from letters to be included for the first time in Professor E. L. Griggs's final collection and from the Notebooks which are Miss K. Coburn's province.

It will be seen, therefore, that a fair amount of the text is new, and that the book is so arranged as to enable the student to find with ease what Coleridge said about Bunyan or Hooker, Cowley or Congreve. As an instrument for the systematic study of Coleridge's thought the book must, of course, be read in a different way, and the index will give some help. Moreover, the brilliant eighteen-page Introduction by Professor Louis Bredvold stresses the value of Miss Brinkley's work for the understanding not only of Coleridge but also of the Seventeenth Century. Insulated in our own age we tend to see that great century too much in the light (or darkness) of our own perplexities, discoveries, or other preoccupations. To see it through the mind of a great man who lived half-way between then and now should lift us out of our temporal insularity and give us a new understanding. If we would know what we are doing, we must also know Coleridge. Mr. Bredvold provides a map of his mind.

This book, it should be emphasized, is not an anthology but a compilation which aims, and, as far as I can see, successfully, at being a complete collection

of Coleridge's relevant expressions of opinion. It does not include mere casual allusions or borrowings such as the 'synodical individuals' of *Biographia Literaria*, ch. ii, who come from Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*. It does, regrettably, include one passage wrongly, the first under Jeremy Taylor: 'Taylor, the English Pagan' is not Jeremy but Thomas Taylor (1758–1835).

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Le Roman régionaliste dans les Îles britanniques, 1800–1950. By L. LECLAIRE. Pp. 300.

A General Analytical Bibliography of the Regional Novelists of the British Isles, 1800–1950. By L. LECLAIRE. Pp. 399 (Collection d'Histoire et de Littérature étrangères). Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1954. No price given.

In these two substantial volumes M. Lucien Leclaire, a Frenchman and Professeur au Lycée Blaise Pascal, Clermont, does for the English regional novel and short story what no scholar of our Four Nations has yet attempted to do. He has presented the whole vast subject in an historical and expository way, with zeal and erudition, with an apparatus of tables, maps, and diagrams, and a Bibliography which he justly invites us to consider as a contribution to scholarship in its own right. 'On ne sera pas surpris que ce travail ait été entrepris pour l'amour du sujet', says M. Leclaire, and the note of informed sympathy is apparent throughout the undertaking. His method is chronological, and the important date for each author is that of the appearance of his first 'regional' work. What results is almost a history of the English novel since 1800, viewed in its regional context. London has been omitted, for a number of good reasons (the most compelling of them that it would require a study of this size all to itself, and that its imperial and cosmopolitan connexions introduce many complications); otherwise there is no lack of writers great and small, for from Maria Edgeworth and Scott to Hardy, Bennett, and Lawrence, the English novelists have drawn deeply upon the life, characters, and manners of those distinctive regions in which are found the strength and savour of the British Isles.

M. Leclaire has organized his abounding material under four heads: La Région dans le roman national, 1800–1830; Le Roman régionaliste 'par surcroît', 1830–1870; Le Roman consciemment régionaliste, 1870–1950 (with its five subdivisions: Le Régionalisme pittoresque, 1870–1895, Le Régionalisme attendri, 1890–1914, Le Régionalisme réaliste et naturaliste, 1900–1925, Le Régionalisme interprétatif, 1920–39, Le Régionalisme pendant la guerre et après): and a thirty-page essay on Le Genre régionaliste. At first one may wonder whether the material has been arranged rather arbitrarily, but the closer one examines the results the more admirable they appear. It is hard to see how one could follow a clearer track from *Castle Rackrent* in 1800 to *Behold Thy Daughter* in 1950, or observe more of the terrain on the way.

In his Bibliography M. Leclaire has aimed at completeness as well as accuracy, though he suspects that to so immense yet single-handed a venture 'a few cor-

rections, and possibly many additions, will be suggested'. My own impression, after an examination of the Welsh entries, is that the Bibliography requires the help of regional experts to make it into a first-class work of reference. M. Leclaire's strength lies in his acquaintance with all the regions, and I know of no one in Great Britain able to check the whole Bibliography; but the following indications of incompleteness and inaccuracy in the Welsh entries may be held to justify my opinion. Thus I find no mention in the thesis or the Bibliography of Alun Lewis, Dylan Thomas, Dorothy Edwards, Ronald Elwy Mitchell, Goronwy Rees, Idwal Jones (the *Whistler's Van* Idwal Jones, to distinguish him from six others of the same name), Richard Hughes, Henry Treece, B. Dew Roberts, Arthur Machen (a Jones who very wisely changed his name), or of T. Rowland Hughes (a special case, admittedly). And I suppose that Mrs. Caradoc Evans (under her pseudonyms Countess Barcynska and Oliver Sandys) ought to be in somewhere with her numerous novels about the Welsh countryside. A second kind of incompleteness is more understandable: M. Leclaire has occasionally missed a book by authors to whom he has given proper attention. To Rhys Davies may be added *Arfon* and *Daisy Matthews* in fiction, as well as *The Story of Wales* and *My Wales*, which contain Davies's trenchant views on Welsh culture and writing; to Margiad Evans *Turf or Stone*; to Geraint Goodwin *Call Back Yesterday*. The correct title of Jack Jones's first volume of autobiography is *Unfinished Journey*, Hilda Vaughan has little to do with North Wales, and Emyr Humphreys's *A Change of Heart* owes something to Aberystwyth as well as to Bangor.

Necessarily, I can best illustrate the Bibliography's inaccuracy too by what it has to say about some of my friends. First, John Cowper Powys. On p. 286 M. Leclaire says: 'The scenes of all his writings are all [*sic*] laid in Dorset.' On p. 287, of *A Glastonbury Romance*: 'Politics, love, lust, nature, all in Somerset.' And he omits *Morwyn or The Vengeance of God* (part Wales, part Hell) and *Owen Glendower* (all Wales). Also *Obstinate Cymric* should be read by any one who writes about J. C. P. Second, let us look for a moment at Caradoc Evans. I blame no one for not knowing the date of his birth, for he was as secretive of it as a shopsoiled beauty, but for the record he was born on 31 December 1878, and christened David. Mrs. Caradoc Evans's *Full and Frank* is an obvious work of reference not listed, and two novels, *This Way to Heaven* and *Morgan Bible*, are omitted. Of *Wasps* there were two first editions in 1933, the first instantly suppressed at the threat of a libel action, though half a dozen copies survive. It is not true that Caradoc's dialogue was 'a literal translation of the Welsh the originals speak'; and *Pilgrims in a Foreign Land* is not adequately described as 'Welsh country manners as usual; set in Cardiganshire. Greed, selfishness, hypocrisy and lust.' This book showed a curious development in Caradoc: his increasing preoccupation with the folk and animal story. To blanket two posthumously published books, *The Earth Gives All and Takes All* and *Mother's Marvel*, with one comment: 'The same people, but none of the former spite', is misleading. The first of these revealed the new, the 'genial' Caradoc; these seven stories were his last work, some of them written for my *Welsh Review*; but *Mother's Marvel* had been hanging about for quite a while before his death. Its history is somewhat obscure, but it reads to me like a product of the early

or mid thirties, and is something of a bore. I could go on with this kind of fault-finding for a good while, but am disposed instead to fall off my high horse and restore even the author's good humour with a low note. The Index associates Gwyn Jones with Glamorgan and Pembrokeshire, but whether they like it or not back home I was born and bred in Monmouthshire, and now live in Cardiganshire, where I occasionally conjure up islands out of the sea.

To sum up, M. Leclaire has displayed to native eyes an immense and variegated landscape, and given it perspective and proportion; but when we survey it at close quarters we find it speckled as a thrush's breast with major truth and minor error. Even so, it is the most useful survey of its kind that we possess.

GWYN JONES

The Manuscript Poems of A. E. Housman. Eight Hundred Lines of Hitherto Uncollected Verse from the Author's Notebooks. Edited by T. B. HABER. Pp. xiv+146. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. 25s. net.

Housman's will permitted his brother Laurence 'to select from my verse manuscript writing and to publish any poems which appear to him to be completed and to be not inferior in quality to the average of my published poems', and directed him 'to destroy all other poems and fragments of verse'. Mr. Laurence Housman made and published a selection from the poetical notebooks of his brother, but in disregard of his will he did not destroy 'all other poems and fragments of verse'. Some he did destroy; but leaves which had on one side drafts of published poems and on the other side fragmentary drafts of poems not chosen for publication were not destroyed. Mr. Housman cut away such parts as had unpublished matter on both sides. The remaining leaves and parts of leaves, after erasing or overscoring most of what had not been published, he pasted on folio sheets so that only the texts of published poems were open to view. In 1939 these sheets were sold to a New York dealer, from whom an American lady bought them. She gave them to the Library of Congress, whose authorities in 1945 detached the leaves from the sheets and, after cleaning them, remounted them with hinges so that everything on them was again open to view. What Mr. Laurence Housman had been enjoined by his brother's will to destroy Mr. Haber has now published. For, as he says in his preface, 'all legal objections have been withdrawn, in writing, by Laurence Housman and Barclays Bank Ltd., the designated trustees'. He goes on to say that the Library of Congress 'has expressed through its Librarian the opinion that, legal permission granted, the publication of the notebook remains involves no ethical consideration which might "embarrass the strictest sense of scholarly propriety" '. Others may judge differently.

Whatever Mr. Haber's previous reputation may have been, the reputation of the Oxford University Press has been damaged by its association with this book.

On p. 42 Mr. Haber gives the following:

> Heard in the hour of pausing voices,
> That brings the turning wheel to stand,

When barges moor and windows glisten,
And lights are faded in the land.

In the facsimile opposite p. 50 it appears that the first letter of the last word in the third line is not 'g' but almost certainly 'f', and Housman probably wrote 'fasten'. On p. 94 Mr. Haber gives 'The sense has left the tablet'; but the facsimile opposite p. 83 shows plainly that Housman wrote not 'tablet' but 'letters'. How often is Mr. Haber at fault? The reader cannot tell. But certainly there are places where this evidence that Mr. Haber is unreliable makes it less probable that Housman wrote something which he did not mean to write than that Mr. Haber is again an inaccurate transcriber. On p. 54 where Mr. Haber gives the following:

Better to think your friend's unkind
Than know your lover's untrue

did Housman write 'love's', or did he write 'lover's' by mistake? On p. 91 in a poem beginning 'Stand back, you men and horses' Mr. Haber gives this:

Die above, O tempests brewing,
I will have heaven serene;

Did Housman write 'Die down', or did he write 'Die above' by mistake? On p. 33 Mr. Haber gives the following:

As often under sighing oak
drowsing
Or near musing hidden laid
Maiden and youth in whispers spoke,
In whispers, youth and maid.

He makes the strange observation that 'this quatrain may represent the beginning of the theme that emerged in' *A.S.L.*, liii; he does not point out the adaptation of Homer, *Iliad*, xxii. 126–8, nor does he remark that 'hidden' is nonsensical. Did Housman write 'linden', or did he write 'hidden' by mistake? On the next page Mr. Haber gives the following:

With odours from the graves of balm
That far away it fanned,
And whispering of the plumy palm
It moved in morning land.

Did Housman write 'groves', or did he write 'graves' by mistake? On the same page Mr. Haber gives this:

Never, or ever, shine or snow,
That son of God I used to know.

Did Housman write 'Never, o never', or did he write 'Never, or ever' by mistake? On p. 94 Mr. Haber gives the following:

May
Next year in our green woodland
Shall stand a naked tree,

Where spring comes north and islands
Turn leafy in the sea.

Did Housman write in the third line not 'where' but 'when'? Compare the lines on p. 87:

Though
When spring comes north and islands
Turn leafy in the sea.

On p. 135 Mr. Haber says that 'the title "The Oracles" must have been the result of a last-minute decision . . .; but the title "The Oracle" had appeared over the poem when it was published in the 1903 *Venture* . . . published by John Bailie'. The publisher was John Baillie, and the title was correctly given in the list of contents as 'The Oracles', although it was misprinted over the poem as 'The Oracle'. On p. 124 Mr. Haber says that Housman 'probably pronounced' *shew* like *show*, as though there were some doubt about the matter. Mr. Haber's use of English is sometimes eccentric. For example, on pp. 120 and 130 he uses the word 'bequest' of gifts made by Housman in his lifetime; on p. 22 he speaks of 'Laurence Housman's obit in the Analysis for the majority of these later items'; on p. 13 he uses the word 'belabour' in the sense of 'overwork'; on p. 130 he speaks of 'a gleam of omnipathy'. His poor knowledge of Latin is shown by his reference on p. 125 to a 'decision *in medias res*'.

To Mr. Haber's footnotes may be added a comparison of 'this fluttering web of life' (p. 106) with Shakespeare, *All's Well that Ends Well*, IV. iii. 83: 'the web of our life is of a mingled yarn'; 'clean of heart' (p. 75) with Psalm li. 10: 'create in me a clean heart'; 'steeple-gloomed' (p. 44) with *A.S.L.*, lxi. 15: 'steeple-shadowed'; midmost of the open wood' (p. 62) with *L.P.*, xxxi. 101: 'midmost of the homeward track'; 'Oh man, the news will keep' (p. 54) with *M.P.*, xlii. 8: 'the news must keep for aye'; 'scans the world for things to die for' (p. 67) and 'my love ,that I was born to die for' (p. 69) with *L.P.*, xxxii. 7–8: 'but it was friends to die for that I would seek and find'.

There are very few memorable lines in this book. Perhaps there are fewer than a score of lines as good as these:

The day the child comes to the birth
He does not laugh, he cries:
So quick he learns the tune that earth
Will sing him till he dies

or these:

Some air that swept the Arabian strand
When the great gulf was calm,
Some wind that waved in morning land
The plumage of the palm.

The pages devoted to abandoned lines and stanzas in published poems have their interest. It is revealed, for example, that the splendid line in *A.S.L.*, xxiii, 'they carry back bright to the coiner the mintage of man', was originally 'they carry unspoilt into darkness the honour of man'. G. B. A. FLETCHER

SHORT NOTICES

Shakespeares Tragödien und Romanzen: Kontinuität oder Umbruch? By HORST OPPEL. Pp. 46 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz). Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1954. DM. 3.60.

Recent critics have been divided whether Shakespeare's defection from tragedy to romance in his last plays is to be regarded as evolutionary or as revolutionary. Professor Oppel pleads strongly for Shakespeare's artistic continuity, taking *Macbeth* I. vi. 6–10 and *Tempest* II. i. 36–53 as a basis for comparison. After showing that in both plays the order–disorder theme fulfils similar functions, that in both the action is contrived to 'make good of bad' (p. 32), he submits that both plays have the same structure ('Beide Dramen zeigen das gleiche Baugesetz' (p. 35)). Other structural elements are of course examined (e.g. imagery), but several important ones are ignored (e.g. staging, metre, the use of magic, and the *deus ex machina* ending). Though Dr. Oppel carries the reader with him as far as he goes, with some penetrating comments on recent criticism, one feels disappointed that he has limited the scope of the argument rather too severely. E. A. J. HONIGMANN

Metaphysical to Augustan. Studies in Tone and Sensibility in the Seventeenth Century. By GEOFFREY WALTON. Pp. 160. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1955. 17*s.* 6*d.* net.

The central three of the seven chapters deal with Cowley. They are preceded by chapters on 'Seventeenth-Century Ideas of Wit' and 'The Tone of Ben Jonson's Poetry', and are followed by chapters on Andrew Marvell and John Norris of Bemerton. The book admittedly grew from a study of Cowley, and the seventy-six pages on Cowley examine him with admirable thoroughness. No one who 'now reads Cowley' need ask for more. Mr. Walton finds in him the transition from Metaphysical to Augustan, and he makes his point.

One can, however, have too much of Cowley, and I find more sustained interest in the other chapters. That on Wit is really illuminating and that on Jonson is, as far as I know, quite original in its approach. Most of the chapter on Marvell, with its emphasis on urbanity, is to be commended, though Mr. Walton fails (in good enough company) over the conclusion of 'To his Coy Mistress' and though there is a bad misprint ('hopeless Right' for 'helpless Right') in a quotation from 'An Horatian Ode'. The final chapter on 'The Poetry of John Norris of Bemerton' is 'A Plea for Recognition'—'though I do not claim major status for him, I hope to indicate the sense of "discovery" one feels after reading through about three-quarters of his volume of pleasing and thoughtful verse on coming upon the poem in which the wheels have indeed taken fire'. The plea is only for recognition, perhaps of Norris (1657–1711) as a belated last of the Metaphysicals, and Mr. Walton produces quite good reasons. H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Samuel Johnson. By MICHAEL JOYCE. Pp. xii+172. London: Longmans, Green, 1955. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Courageously, Mr. Joyce has attempted the impossible: a book about Johnson which somehow keeps the 'irrepressible Boswell' in his place. Boswell wins hands down. The old anecdotes reappear and the 'circle' sit for refurbished portraits. Of course, any new short study of Johnson must suffer because it is impossible to remove the Boswellian varnish

in 50,000 words and because of the inevitable comparison with Macaulay's *Life of Johnson* and Raleigh's Leslie Stephen Lecture. What the student needs most today is a guide who will lay bare the formative years of Johnson through a study of all his hastily composed words. (For the variety of topics discussed in these periodical contributions makes Boswell's *Life* appear narrow.) This appears to be Mr. Joyce's intention, but the achievement falls short of it. Even so, for the general reader and the younger student this book will prove an admirable guide. The 'Review of Soame Jenyns' takes up too much space and *Rasselas* and the poems are hurriedly dismissed, but the balance is fairly held on most biographical matters except one. Tetty's hold over Johnson is not treated with ridicule and the Thrales and Lord Chesterfield get their due; Boswell is shown in a favourable light. Further, the great tasks of the Doctor's life are sufficiently highlighted to explain his contemporary reputation: *The Rambler*, the *Dictionary*, the *Shakespeare*, and the *Lives of the Poets* form the stout framework on to which anecdotes and quotations are decorously stitched. There is the one exception. Mr. Joyce wisely uses Johnson's letters and his *Prayers and Meditations* to throw light on the inner conflict that racked him, but merely from the evidence supplied in this book the reader cannot accept its explanation of his neglect of his mother or the direct assertion that the obsessive fear of death was always a factor in Johnson's life. The Thralian hints, though they give a glimpse of abnormality, are insufficient to point towards the former and the late death-bed quotations are not enough support for the latter. Here alone compression has done the writer's thesis less than justice.

I think that the assumption behind this book, that Johnson was an unwilling writer who longed, and tried, to become a man of action, is a strange interpretation of his life and works; and, although I applaud the skill with which Mr. Joyce has compressed so much real scholarship into such readable pages, this tendency to play down Johnson the writer spoils the final portrait. *Hamlet* needs its prince; even Boswell would not have immortalized a talker for his speech alone.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

A History of English Drama 1660–1900. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Vol. IV: Early Nineteenth Century Drama. Pp. x+668. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. 55*s.* net.

With this volume the Cambridge University Press continues its work of reissuing the various parts of Professor Nicoll's comprehensive history of English drama after the Restoration. *Early Nineteenth Century Drama* was originally published in 1930 in two volumes, the second consisting of the indispensable Handlist of Plays. The reissue combines the two into a single volume and adds to the original text Supplementary Notes which are wholly bibliographical in content. The Handlist of Plays has also been brought up to date, a substantial achievement in this period, with its surfeit of carpenter-playwrights and unacknowledged adaptations. In particular, Mr. Nicoll has accepted the attributions of Sir St. Vincent Troubridge and the late Allan Wade in successive issues of *Theatre Notebook*.

The value of Mr. Nicoll's work, already widely recognized, is increased in this revised and compact edition. The appearance of the first of the nineteenth-century volumes, however, draws renewed attention to their lack of illustrations. If ever there was an era in English drama essentially visual in appeal, it was the period covered by this volume. A picture will disclose more about Edmund Kean's acting, about Planché's costumes or Stanfield's scenery, than many pages of description. If an illustrated edition of *A History of English Drama* is not feasible, may one hope for an 'English Supplement' to Mr. Nicoll's equally authoritative *Development of the Theatre*?

GEORGE ROWELL

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 74, Heft 1, 1956

Unity and Multiplicity in *The Faerie Queene* (H. P. Guth), 1–15.

'One of the Least Typical of all Elizabethans' (H. Oppel), 16–65.

Entwicklung und Wandlung des Topos 'Locus Amoenus' bei Keats (H. Viebrock), 66–101.

Saint Joan—die Quelle und ihre Bearbeitung (R. Schirmer-Imhoff), 102–32.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xxxix, No. 1, September 1956

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as a friend of Continental Writers (R. Halsband), 57–74.

The English Cistercians and the Bestiary (J. Morson), 146–70.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxvii, No. 4, August 1956

Chaucer's 'O Sentence' in the *Hous of Fame* (G. Stillwell), 149–57.

Again: Fall-Rise Intonations in English (M. Schubiger, W. R. Lee), 157–62.

On the Pronunciation of Recent French Loan-Words (K. Sørensen), 162–8.

Current Literature, 1955 (F. T. Wood), 186–90.

Vol. xxxvii, No. 5, October 1956

Aspects of Jeremy Taylor's Style (J. R. King), 197–210.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. vi, No. 3, July 1956

Cliché and Commonplace (L. D. Lerner), 249–65.

The Heart of Midlothian: Scott as Artist (R. Mayhead), 266–77.

Keats's *Ode to Psyche* (K. Allott), 278–301.

T. S. Eliot on Culture (R. Williams), 302–18.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

IXe Année, No. 3, juillet–septembre 1956

La Date du mariage de Sir Walter Ralegh (P. Lefranc), 193–211.

Wyndham Lewis ou J'ai du génie (J.-J. Mayoux), 212–24.

A Birth-Date for Sir Walter Ralegh (A. M. C. Latham), 243–5.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. lv, No. 2, April 1956

Dryden's Epistle to Charleton (E. R. Wasserman), 201–12.

Donne, Montaigne, and Natural Law (R. Ornstein), 213–29.

Milton's *Apologus* and its Mantuan Model (H. Fletcher), 230–3.

Nicholas Udall in the Indexes of Prohibited Books (W. L. Edgerton), 247–52.

LETTERATURE MODERNE

Anno vi, N. 4, luglio–agosto 1956

Il Diario di Virginia Woolf (G. Caliumi), 472–8.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxv, No. 1, 1956

Dolopathos and the Seven Sages of Rome (J. Crosland), 1–12.

The Binding of Weland (L. Whitbread), 13–19.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxi, No. 6, June 1956

'Moedes or Prolaciouns' in Chaucer's *Boece* (J. Hollander), 397–9.

Three New Latin Poems of Giles Fletcher the Elder (R. R. Raymo), 399–401.

The Probable Source for Spenser's Tobacco Reference (E. K. Brady), 402–4.

The *Scala Religionis* in *Paradise Lost* (D. C. Allen), 404–5.

Jonathan Swift, Freeman of Dublin (O. W. Ferguson), 405–9.

Gray's 'Epitaph' Revisited (M. Peckham), 409–11.
Irony in Blake's *Holy Thursday* (R. F. Gleckner), 412–15.
Bishop Blougram's Miracles (R. C. Schweik), 416–18.
Yanko Goorall, a Note on Name Symbolism in Conrad's *Amy Foster* (E. Wasiolek), 418–19.
Dramatic Irony in Hawthorne's Romances (R. Stanton), 420–6.
Robert James, Diderot, and the *Encyclopédie* (J. Doolittle), 431–4.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY
Vol. xvii, No. 2, June 1956
Romain Rolland and Thomas Hardy (W. T. Starr), 99–103.
Dr. Johnson and the Collect (R. S. Sutherland), 111–17.
The Glass Strip: a Recurrent Image in Melville (A. Sale), 118–27.
A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for 1955 (P. A. Brown), 128–52.

Vol. xvii, No. 3, September 1956
Chaucer's Use of the Mystery Plays in the *Miller's Tale* (K. B. Harder), 193–8.
Spenser's Sabaoth's Rest (L. S. Friedland), 199–203.
Pope and Twickenham's Famous Preacher (F. E. Litz), 204–12.
The Literary Impact of *Vestiges of Creation* (M. Millhauser), 213–26.
The Literary Fortune of William Blake in France (A. Balakian), 261–72.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW
Vol. li, No. 4, October 1956
Primary Sources and Associations of Dunbar's Aureate Imagery (I. Hyde), 481–92.
Walt Whitman's French (K. H. Francis), 493–506.
How many Grave-diggers has *Hamlet?* (H. Jenkins), 562–5.
Boundary between Deira and Bernicia (B. Foster), 565–6.

MODERN PHILOLOGY
Vol. liv, No. 1, August 1956
The Prioress's Dogs and Benedictine Discipline (J. M. Steadman), 1–6.
Middleton's Tragicomedies (S. Schoenbaum), 7–19.
Milton's Later Sonnets and the Cambridge Manuscript (M. Kelley), 20–25.
War and Peace and *The Dynasts* (E. Clifford), 33–44.

NEOPHILOLOGUS
40ste Jaarg., Afl. 3, July 1956
The Grounds of Literary Criticism (L. C. Knights), 207–15.
C. M. Wieland and M. G. Lewis (K. S. Guthke), 231–3.

40ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, October 1956
The *Gawain* Group, Cruxes, Etymologies, Interpretations (ii) (C. A. Luttrell), 290–301.
On a New Theory of OE. Poetic Diction (C. Schaar), 301–5.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN
Vol. lvii, Nos. 3–4, July 1956
'Chalking' Furs (T. F. Mustanoja), 126–8.
Troilus and Cressida, IV. ii. 56 (V. B. Reed), 128–32.
Novelists' Thoughts about Their Art (R. Koskimies), 148–59.

Vol. lvii, Nos. 5–6, September 1956
The Erotic Dream in Medieval English Lyrics (P. J. Frankis), 228–37.
Sir Thopas, ll. 772–4 (M. J. Donovan), 237–46.
Spenser's Role in the Controversy over Quantitative Verse (R. O. Evans), 246–56.
'Runaways Eyes' and 'Children's Eyes' Again [*R. & J.* III. ii. 6 and Sonnet 9] (L. Spitzer), 257–60.

NOTES AND QUERIES
Vol. iii, N.S., No. 8, August 1956
Tony Weller's trade, 324–8.
Perplexities in Peele's *Edward the First*, 328–9.
William Jaggard, 329–30.
'Alcides and his rage', 330–1.

Vocabulary of John Marston (viii), 331–2.
The Great Plague in Croydon, 332–4.
William Hog and Milton's 'two-handed engine', 335.
Dryden's 'Mac Flecknoe', 335–7.
An epilogue to *Pastor Fido*, 337–8.
Two Rochester songs, 338–9.
Pope echoes Addison, 339.
Parnell's *Batrachomuomachia*, 339–42.
Hogarth's Sarah Malcolm, 342–3.
Lord Hailes's notes on Johnson's *Lives*, 343–6.
Johnson's edition of Ascham, 346–7.
Boswell's Langton and the River Wey, 347–9.
Goldsmith and the *Weekly Magazine*, 350–1.
Blake and Percy's *Reliques*, 352–3.
G. M. Hopkins and the windhover, 354.
The authorship of *The Arte of English Poesie*, 362.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 9, September 1956
The Shipman's Tale and the Wife of Bath, 372–3.
Roger Ascham and the Regius Professorships, 373–4.
Chaucer's 'whelp', 374–5.
A common Tudor expletive, 375–6.
'A Quip for an Upstart Courtier', 376–7.
Manningham's libel on Marston, 377–8.
Cressid's diet, 378–9.
Two character portrayals in *Cymbeline*, 379–80.
'Wily Beguiled', 380–3.
Marvell his own critic, 383–4.
Milton, Phineas Fletcher, Spenser, and Ovid—Sin at Hell's Gates, 384–6.
Anne Bradstreet and Keats, 386–8.
Blythburgh Church (C) [Misprint in 1611 New Testament], 388.
A Cibber 'puff', 388–91.
Fielding and the Forty-five, 391–4.
Thomas Wilkinson, 394–5.
A metaphor from Jonathan Edwards, 396.
Byron in Venice, 396–7.
Arnold's 'Tyrian trader' in Thucydides, 397.
Baiting of bulls and boars, 398–401.
Search for Spenser's grave, 407.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 10, October 1956
Faustus and Averroes, 416.
'Simbolisme' in *The Praise of Music* (1586), 416–17.
Another Titus and Gysippus, 417.
Dido in Sidney's *Arcadia*, 417–19.
Shakespeare's 'Moat Defensive', 419–20.
2 and 3 Henry VI, 420–1.
Links with Shakespeare (xiv), 421–3.
The first night of *Twelfth Night*, 423–4.
The 'Fairies' midwife', 424.
Shakespeare and Erasmus, 424–5.
Attacks on the *Critical Review*, 425.
John Dennis's 'stolen thunder', 425–8.
Pepys and Peg Hughes, 428–9.
The verses on Marlborough's exile, 429–30.
Pope's 'Words are like leaves', 430–1.
Chesterfield Agelastus, 431–2.
Goldsmith attributions, 432–5.
Coleridge, Byron, and Schiller, 436–8.
Renaissance plagiarism, 438–9.
The date of Shelley's *Ozymandias*, 439–40.
Ozymandias and Nineveh, 440–1.
Godwin, Holcroft, and William Dunlap, 441–3.
Bloomfield's Aeolus, 450–1.
'Topping', 452.
Peele's *Edward I*: Mortimer and the Potter, 456.
Peele's 'Arraignment', 456.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 11, November 1956
Chaucer in Stow's *Summarye*, 462.
The Northern Rising (1570), 462–5.
T. Platter on the Elizabethan Stage, 465–7.
'Not shriving time allow'd', 467–9.

'The sneaking fellow' [*T. & C.* I. ii. 246–9], 469–70.
Othello v. ii. 258 ['naked'], 470.
Vocabulary of John Marston (ix), 470–1.
'Volpone' and Renaissance psychology, 471–2.
Chapman and Crashaw, 472–3.
Urquhart's universal language, 473–6.
'Evil Communications' [false attribution by Milton and Fielding], 477.
Benlowes and Brome, 477.
Swift and Catullus [derivation of 'Lilliput'], 477–9.
Fielding and the 'Forty-five', 479–82.
Social History in the Dictionary [Dyche and Pardon's *Dictionary* 1744], 482–5.
Rasselas and *De Senectute*, 485–6.
Lord Hailes's notes on Johnson's *Lives*, 486–9.
Goldsmith in the *Literary Magazine*, 489–93.
Wordsworth's *Tintern Abbey*, ll. 88–93, 493–4.
Sir W. Beechey, 494–6.
Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, 497–9.
Wuthering Heights and *Shirley*, 499–500.
Browning's *Andrea del Sarto*, 500–2.
In Memoriam and *David Copperfield*, 502.
'Posh', 503.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
Vol. xxxv, No. 2, April 1956
The Romantic Movement: a Bibliography for 1955 (J. R. Derby), 97–174.
The Seasonal Motif of Keats's Ode 'To Autumn' (S. C. Wilcox), 194–5.
Literature and Dogma: Arnold's Letters to George Smith (F. G. Townsend), 195–8.
An Apparent Influence of Thomas Moore on Longfellow (R. H. Morrison), 198–200.
Whitman's 'Apple-peelings' (W. D. Templeman), 200–2.
Weard Scildinga (*Beowulf*, 305–6) (W. B. Piper), 202–6.
Beowulf 2231a: (R. P. Creed), 206–8.
Possible Irish Analogues for *The Wife's Lament* (G. W. Dunleavy), 208–13.
Declynede, Piers Plowman, A IV. 133 (A. H. Orrick), 213–15.
Sir Thopas' 'Charbocle' (J. L. Melton), 215–17.
The Dering Version of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* (H. Craig), 218–19.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Vol. lxxi, No. 4, Parts 1–2, September 1956
Mythic Patterns in *To the Lighthouse* (J. L. Blotner), 547–62.
Emma: Character and Construction (E. F. Shannon, Jr.), 637–50.
Blake's Revisions of *The Tyger* (M. K. Nurmi), 669–85.
The School for Scandal (A. Schiller), 694–704.
Seventeenth-century Quaker Style (J. I. Cope), 725–54.
Coriolanus, Alceste, and Dramatic Genres (N. A. Brittin), 799–807.
The Diction of Hooker's *Polity* M. S. Stueber), 808–26.
Some Unpublished Poems by John Leland (L. Bradner), 827–36.

SEWANEE REVIEW
Vol. lxiv, No. 3, Summer 1956
The Criticism of T. S. Eliot (R. Wellek), 398–443.
Drama in England (B. Dobrée), 470–84.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY
Vol. liii, No. 3, July 1956
Malory's 'Vertuouse Love' (R. T. Davies), 459–69.
Wardship in English Drama (1600–50), (G. H. Blayney), 470–84.
Paradise Lost and the Index of Prohibited Books (E. F. Kenrich), 485–500.
The Wartons 'Romanticize' their Verse (A. Fenner), 501–8.

THE DICKENSIAN

53rd YEAR OF PUBLICATION

Devoted to the study of Dickens. Published by the Dickens Fellowship in January, May, and September

12*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free

Specimen copy on request

'This is a monument if you like; the continued prosperity of this periodical is a finer testimony to the glory and honour of its subject than any bronze or marble could be.' E. V. LUCAS

THE DICKENS HOUSE
48 Doughty Street, London, W.C. 1

HEFFER'S

A CAMBRIDGE BOOKSHOP THAT IS KNOWN IN ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD

●

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
Petty Cury, Cambridge

The Correspondence of
ALEXANDER POPE

Edited by GEORGE SHERBURN

'The fascination of reading Pope's letters lies in the revelation of a personality, one not altogether deducible from his works alone. . . . Professor Sherburn, as was only to be expected from so admirable a scholar and so humane an interpreter of Pope, has produced an edition incomparably better than that of Elwin and Courthope, indispensable as that has been till now.' *The Times* Five volumes £10. 10s. net

SHELLEY AT WORK

A Critical Inquiry

NEVILLE ROGERS

'His exegesis is brilliant. . . . we now know with much more certainty where Shelley found most of his ideas, how those ideas were absorbed and transmuted in the process of composition, and what general coherence and tendency they possess.' *The Listener* Illustrated 35s. net

COMPLAINT AND SATIRE IN EARLY ENGLISH LITERATURE

JOHN PETER

The primary purpose of this book is to consider the satirical poems and plays which appeared in England about the turn of the sixteenth century. Particular attention is given to the medieval tradition of Complaint, from which the satires of the Renaissance derived. The satirical movement is also related to subsequent developments in English poetry. 45s. net

Further Letters of
GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS

Including his Correspondence with Coventry Patmore

Edited by CLAUDE COLLEER ABBOTT

A volume of *Further Letters* was first published in 1938. Since then a considerable store of new material has been collected, including a large number of family letters (found in 1952) written by Hopkins mainly to his mother, and covering most years of his life.

Second edition Illustrated 50s. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Printed in Great Britain by Charles Batey at the University Press, Oxford